

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICHIGAN

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 58, St. Albans Road, Edinburgh.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.R.A.

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.

Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A.

Prof. E. WILLIAMSON, M.A. (Hon. Treasurer).

Representing the Council of the Classical Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary), representing the Oxford Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. J. WOODHOUSE, University of Sydney.

Vol. XLVII

NOVEMBER, 1933

No. 5

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS	161	REVIEWS (continued):	
ROBERT SEYMOUR CONWAY	162	<i>Plauti Mercator</i> (Enk). W. BEARE ..	184
VARIA. I. J. D. DENNISTON	163	<i>Lucilio e i suoi frammenti</i> , etc. (Bolisani).	
SIMONIDES AND CLAUROS. H. J. ROSE ..	165	C. J. FORDYCE	185
PINDAR, O. 8, 53-64. P. B. R. FORBES ..	167	<i>C.I.L.</i> (parts); <i>Inscriptiones Italiae</i> (parts).	
SOPHRON AND THROCRITUS: ADDENDUM.		H. LAST	186
A. S. F. GOW	168	<i>The Cambridge Ancient History</i> , IX. W. E.	
'ANIMAMQVE SVPERBAM' AND OCTAVIAN.		HEITLAND	188
W. F. J. KNIGHT	169	<i>Die Kultur der ciceronischen Zeit</i> , I (Kroll).	
ANCIENT CHEMICAL WARFARE. D'A. W.		J. WIGHT DUFF	191
THOMPSON	171	<i>Ciceronis pro Caelio</i> (Austin); <i>pro Ligario</i>	
REVIEWS:		(Giusti). L. H. G. GREENWOOD ..	192
<i>The Technique of Early Greek Sculpture</i>		<i>Illustratieve Woordschikking bij Vergilius</i>	
(Casson). T. B. L. WEBSTER	172	(Ramondt). R. S. CONWAY	194
<i>Die Einschaltung des Schiffkatalogs</i> (Jacoby).		<i>The Acts of the Apostles</i> (Clark). J. M.	
C. M. BOWRA	174	CREED	194
<i>Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der delisch-</i>		<i>Rutilius Claudius Namatianus</i> (Helm). M.	
<i>attischen Symmachie</i> (Nesselhauf). N. G. L.		PLATNAUER	196
HAMMOND	175	<i>Justinian</i> (Baker). N. H. BAYNES ..	197
<i>Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth</i>		<i>Byzantine Civilization</i> (Runciman). G.	
<i>Century</i> (Meritt). R. MEIGGS	176	BUCKLER	198
<i>Sophokles</i> (Weinstock). J. T. SHEPPARD ..	177	<i>Das Generationsproblem</i> .. (Drerup). J. L.	
<i>Aristophanes: A Study</i> (Murray). A. W.		MYRES	199
PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE	178	<i>A Comparative Study of the Brownie and</i>	
<i>God in Greek Philosophy</i> ... (Hack). R. B.		<i>the Aeneid</i> (Haber). R. B. ONIANS ..	200
ONIANS	180	<i>The Master Craftsmen</i> (Gompertz). C. F. C.	
<i>What Plato Said</i> (Shorey). G. C. FIELD ..	181	HAWKES	201
<i>Aristoteles qui fertur libellus De Mundo</i> (Lorimer).		SHORT REVIEWS	202
W. D. ROSS	182	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	206
<i>Greece and the Aegean</i> (Gardner). A. M.		BOOKS RECEIVED	208
WOODWARD	183		

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 2s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. F. C. G. Langford, 35, Alleyn Park, Dulwich, S.E. 21. Inquiries should be sent to The Triangle Offices, 61, South Molton Street, W. 1, addressed either to the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Miss E. C. Gedge and Mr. R. M. Rattenbury) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

WORKS BY A. F. MURISON

THE ILIAD OF HOMER

Rendered in English Hexameters

Vol. I. Books I.—XII. 10s. 6d. net

THE ODES OF PINDAR

RENDERED IN ENGLISH VERSE

10s. 6d. net

THE BUCOLICS AND GEORGICS OF VERGIL

RENDERED IN ENGLISH HEXAMETERS

7s. 6d. net

HORACE

RENDERED IN ENGLISH VERSE

12s. 6d. net

SCHILLER'S WALLENSTEIN

A DRAMATIC POEM

RENDERED IN ENGLISH VERSE

12s. 6d. net

LONGMANS GREEN & CO. LTD.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C. 4

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1933

NOTES AND NEWS

In his brief biography and appraisal of Louis Claude Purser, reprinted from the Proceedings of the British Academy, Professor A. C. Clark has found a congenial task, and has performed it well. 'That Oscar Wilde' (Purser's undergraduate contemporary at Trinity) 'was not so studious as Purser may be inferred from a curious piece of evidence. This is contained in an old note-book found among Purser's papers after his death, on a page of which there is a scrawl in Wilde's handwriting, "If he puts me on to construe, I shall say that it is your turn." These words supply the key to much in Purser's subsequent career. Throughout his life his fate was to do the work of others, as well as his own.' And not only his fate, but his pleasure. Professor Clark lays just stress on the solid contribution to Latin scholarship of a man whose self-effacing kindness many have cause to remember.

A notable event in the history of scholarship was the appearance, in July of this year, of the first number of *Türk Tarih, Arkeologya ve Etnografya Dergisi*, the Bulletin of Turkish History, Archaeology and Ethnography. This number, of 195 pages, contains articles both by Turkish contributors and by foreign scholars who have worked in Turkey; it is profusely illustrated, and very sensibly devotes the bulk of its space to brief and businesslike descriptions of recent archaeological finds. It opens, very appropriately, with an account by Dr. Hamit Zübeyr of the contents of some graves recently opened on the estate of Mustafa Kemal at Gazi, near Ankara; devotes over seventy pages to Hittite and other early finds at Alishahr and Kültepe; and comprises a number of shorter articles on Turkish folklore

and on miscellaneous antiquities, Islamic and earlier, including two Greek tombstones. In a list of foreign scholars who have worked in Turkey we note the name of Büyük Ramsay, 'Ramsay the Great.' Summaries in French and in English are appended. This most useful Bulletin deserves a warm welcome, and the support of scholars.

We have been asked by the Secretary of the Fürstlich Jablonowskische Gesellschaft to announce that the subject of the historical-philological essay for 1933 is 'The older history of Sparta.' The essay should be a comprehensive account of all the artistic, religious, cultural and political facts concerning Sparta down to the fifth century, and should include an investigation of the relations of the Spartiates to the subject people and surrounding states and the conditions which brought about the growth and decline of Spartan civilization. Either German or Latin may be used. Essays must be sent in by 31st December, 1933. The prize is 500 RM, or the gold medal of the founder and 250 RM. The Society charges itself with the publication of the successful essay. Enquiries may be addressed to the Secretary, Professor Dr. Peter Debye, Leipzig C I, Linnéstrasse 4.

As this number goes to press we learn with sorrow of the death of Frederick William Hall, President of St. John's College, Oxford, for the last twenty-two months of a not long life. His books and articles bear witness to the sanity and precision of his scholarship, and the editors of the *Classical Review* have reason to know with what judgment, tact, and courtesy he edited the *Classical Quarterly*.

ROBERT SEYMOUR CONWAY.

THE death of Dr. Conway will be mourned by all friends of classical studies. It is impossible to give in these few lines an adequate picture of that many-sided personality and of the work which he accomplished in so many directions.

Robert Seymour Conway was educated at the City of London School; at Gonville and Caius College, of which he became a Fellow; and in Germany, under Brugmann. After lecturing at Newnham College he was appointed Professor of Latin at Cardiff, and ten years later at Manchester, whence he retired in 1929, at the age of sixty-five. In the last fifteen years of his life honours fell thick upon him, and in 1927 he received the distinction which he perhaps prized most of all, the presidency of the Classical Association. A few years ago he gave by invitation a series of lectures in Australia. The United States of America claimed him in the same capacity on three occasions.

A full list of his writings would occupy several columns. His *Italic Dialects* at once took its place beside the work of von Planta as marking a new era in the study of the subject. The great critical edition of Livy was begun in conjunction with Professor Flamstead Walters. Two volumes appeared under their joint care and a third volume under Conway's editorship. Professor S. K. Johnson was assumed as co-editor after the death of Walters, and the remainder of the Third Decade is now in the press. This edition, the fruit of immense labour, has been widely acclaimed as putting the critical study of Livy on a new and secure basis. Volumes of essays appeared in 1921, 1928, 1931 and 1933. The title of the first of these volumes, *New Studies of a Great Inheritance*, is a true indication of the faith which animated all Conway's work. His continued interest in the ethnography of ancient Italy showed itself in his contributions to the *Cambridge Ancient History*, the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and other publications. A comprehensive work on the language and inscriptions of the Veneti has long been ready, and

will soon be published under the auspices of the British Academy.

These and his other publications would be a sufficient monument for most men, but in the eyes of those who have been acquainted with Conway's restless activity they will scarcely seem to constitute the main part of his achievements. He was one of the founders of the Classical Association, and no one has devoted more time and zeal to the objects for which it was founded. A glance at the annual *Proceedings* will show how his influence permeated the deliberations and enterprises of the Association. It was only a just recognition of his devotion to the cause when he was elected President. In this journal a special word of acknowledgment is due to the services which he rendered as a member of the Classical Journals Board. Only those who have served with him know how zealously he watched over the progress of the *Classical Quarterly* and the *Classical Review*. In all his busy life he never grudged the time and trouble of a journey to London for this purpose.

Of his remarkable work in Manchester the present writer, who has known it at close quarters, would fain say much more than is here possible. Not content with founding a local branch of the Classical Association, Conway gave the community a real interest in it, especially by promoting the excavation of Roman sites in Lancashire, Cheshire, and Derbyshire, and by taking measures to preserve and record the various remains. As a university teacher he showed conspicuous gifts. He made his students feel that Latin studies were worth the devotion of a lifetime. Those who did not treat them so might cower before his withering gaze and strident rebuke, but in the end they were likely to fall under the fascination of this man whose earnestness was not untinted with humour, and who could present to their astonished eyes such unsuspected genius and beauty in Virgil and Horace, and even in the Latin language itself. He instituted a 'Virgil Discussion Class,' in

which generations of undergraduates found not only a valuable training but a lasting inspiration. During the twenty-six years of his Manchester professorship he took a keen interest in the work of the schools and in the policy and activities of the Northern Universities Joint Matriculation Board. His passion for education, and especially his labours as an 'Ambassador of Rome,' have been a potent influence in the north of England. As a public lecturer he interested both the scholar and the 'plain man.' His favourite subjects were Cicero, Livy, and the Augustan poets, above all Virgil.

No one has ever loved Virgil more devotedly. With characteristic courage and optimism he began in his old age a nominal revision of Conington, which would in reality have been a new work. This, like his Livy, must now pass into other hands, but it is cheering to know that he has left behind him a complete commentary on *Aeneid* I. His published lectures on various aspects of

Virgil's art and personality, valuable though they are, do not give full scope for the display of his interpretative powers. They also derive weakness as well as strength from the fact that they were originally composed for oral delivery: some passages are less convincing in cold print than they were in the warm glow of the lecture-room. Nevertheless, no reader of these lectures can fail to be stimulated by their vigorous freshness and deeply impressed by the sympathetic insight which pervades them.

Nil actum credens cum quid superesset agendum might serve as the motto of Conway's life. He was for ever setting something in motion. If in his zeal he sometimes impinged rather violently upon less impulsive persons, even they had to admit that he was a vitalizing force as well as a generous opponent. He was a warm-hearted friend, and was never happier than when helping younger people on the road to success.

A.

VARIA.

I.

HESIOD, *Theogony* 610.

ὅς δέ κε τέτμη ἀταρτηροῖο γενέθλης

'Whosoever hath gotten an evil family,' Mair: 'whoever happens to have mischievous children,' Evelyn-White. But Hesiod is discussing *wives*. There are advantages, and disadvantages, in having no wife at all: advantages, and disadvantages, in having a good wife. But what if one has a bad wife? If γενέθλης means 'family,' this possibility is ignored. Yet Hesiod on Marriage without the Termagant Wife is *Hamlet* without the Prince of Denmark. γενέθλης can mean 'stock,' 'breed': and Hesiod surely means 'whoever lights on an evil breed in choosing a partner.' (Mazon renders, rightly, 's'il tombe sur une espèce folle.')

AESCH. *Ag.* 884-5ὥστε σύγγονον
βροτοῖσι τὸν πεσόντα λακτίσαι πλέον.

(1) Comparative ὥστε occurs at least fifty-five times in the tragedians: it is

mostly found in similes, and naturally so, since it is a survival of the Homeric ὥς τε, where τε is 'epic,' and probably conveys the idea of habitual occurrence (Wentzel and Monro). The verb is either expressed, in the indicative, or supplied from the context. (2) ὥστε giving a causal colour to a participial clause occurs at least twenty times in Herodotus and twice in Thucydides (no doubt under Herodotean influence).

What verb are we to supply with ὥστε in *Ag.* 884, ἐστὶ or ὄν? The sense required is causal, 'Quippe cum innatum sit hominibus iacentem conculare.' The ellipse of ὄν after ὥς would be possible (cf. *X. Cyr.* V i. 13 σὺν πρώτος, ὥς οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον (sc. ὄν) τὸ κλέπτειν, αἰτιᾶ τὸν κλέπτοντα, and see further Kühner-Gerth ii. 102 and Stallbaum on *Pl. Gorg.* 495c.). That no example is to be found of a similar ellipse after ὥστε is not perhaps a strong objection: ὥστε σύγγονον for ὥστε σύγγονον ὄν might pass muster in Herodotus. A far more serious difficulty is that causal ὥστε with participle

is confined to Herodotus and Thucydides, and is never found in tragedy. On the other hand we can hardly supply *ἐστὶ*, since a causal force is required here, and *ὥστε* in the tragedians always introduces a comparison, meaning *tamquam, velut, never quippe cum*. (In *Theb.* 13 *ὥστε* is read by late MSS only, and Wilamowitz and Tucker read *ὡς τι* after M's *ὥστι*.)

The solution is, I believe, to read *ὡς τε, separatim*, 'and adding that . . .' It would be pedantic to object that the third *τε* intrudes upon the duality of the *ἀμφίλεκτα πήματα*.

Cho. 879-80.

καὶ μάλ' ἡβώντος δὲ δεῦ
οὐχ ὡς δ' ἀρήξει διαπεπραγμένῳ· τί γάρ·

So Wilamowitz and Tucker, keeping *οὐχ ὡς δ'* of M: *οὐχ ὥστε* Porson, Sidgwick. The former is questionable because *ὡς* with infinitive is confined to 'formelhafte Infinitive' (*ὡς εἰπεῖν*, etc.), and *ὡς εἶναι* (Kühner-Gerth, ii. 508-9): the latter, because *δ'* is indispensable. I suggest *οὐδ' ὡς δ' ἀρήξει*, which gives a stronger sense: 'but for all his lustiness he will avail nothing.' (I now find that Wordsworth conjectured *οὐχ ὡς δ' ἀρήξει*. But *οὐδέ* is needed with *ὡς* here. For *οὐδ' ὡς*, καὶ *ὡς*, see Jebb on *S. Ant.* 1042, Kühner-Blass, i. 618, Anm. 5: and for *ὡς* in tragedy not following *οὐδέ* or *καί*, see Wecklein on *I.T.* 603, Sandys on *Bacch.* 1068.)

P.V. 332-4.

ζηλῶ σ' ὁθοῦνέκ' ἐκτός αἰτίας κυρεῖς,
πάντων μετασχὼν καὶ τετολμηκῶς ἐμοί.
καὶ νῦν ἔασον μηδὲ σοὶ μελῆσάτω.

There are two objections to 333 as it stands. (1) *πάντων μετασχὼν* is separated from *ἐμοί* by καὶ τετολμηκῶς. *S. Ant.* 537, cited in support, is different: καὶ ξυμμετίσχω καὶ φέρω τῆς αἰτίας: here the partitive genitive is partly governed by φέρω, though ξυμμετίσχω no doubt helps the construction (see Jebb). (2) Oceanus has not shared in Prometheus' venture: and the line can hardly be taken as ironical.¹ Attempts

¹ Mr. Thomson meets this difficulty by suggesting *πάντων μετασχὼν δὴ τετολμηκῶς τ' ἐμοί*, which is attractive (or, alternatively, *δῆτα τολμή-*

have been made to make it refer to O.'s visit of sympathy: e.g., by reading *τούτων* (or *πόνων*) *μετασχεῖν καὶ* ('actually') *τετολμηκῶς ἐμοί*. But it is early days yet to say that O. has not incurred the anger of Zeus by his visit. Further, the perfect *τετολμηκῶς καὶ νῦν* suggest that the sense is: 'I congratulate you on your good sense in refusing to aid my venture in the past, and suggest that you continue (καὶ νῦν) to keep clear of trouble.' This sense can be got by reading *πάντων μετασχεῖν οὐ τετολμηκῶς ἐμοί*. For the confusion of *-ειν* and *-ων* cf. *Aj.* 1160, *O.T.* 227, 1170, Pearson, *C.R.* XXIII 172. The alteration of *οὐ* to *καί* would follow as a necessary consequence. That Schol. M paraphrases *θαυμάζω σε πῶς οὐδὲν πέπονθας ὑπὸ Διὸς συναλγῶν μοι* only shows the corruption to be an old one.

(It may perhaps be objected that *πάντων*, standing first in the clause, should be emphatic, which with my reading and rendering it certainly cannot be. But the objection is not, I think, a fatal one.)

SOPH. O.T. 677.

σοῦ μὲν τυχὼν ἀγνώτος, ἐν δὲ τοῖσδ' ἴσος.

'ἴσος, *aequus*, just,' Jebb. But the word means 'impartial.' A *δικαστής* is *κοινός* when he listens to both sides, *ἴσος* when he listens to both equally. The adjective really stands for an adverb, qualifying the action implied in the substantive, *δικαστής, κριτής*. I do not think the Greeks could say *ἴσος ἀνὴρ*, 'an impartial man.' (The English itself is unnatural.) *Phil.* 685 *ἴσος ὢν ἴσοις ἀνὴρ*, which Jebb quotes, is different: 'a man who is content to live on a footing of equality with his fellows,' as opposed to the man who is not content *μετὰ πολλῶν ἰσονομεῖσθαι* (*Thuc.* VI 38. 5). (I think that Jebb's note *ad loc.* is misleading.) Nor would 'impartial' suit the present passage. Creon is protesting his loyalty, and a loyalist is not impartial towards his sovereign. The unsuitability of *ἴσος* has passed unnoticed because *δίκαιος* means both 'just' and 'good,' and

σας τ': but I doubt *δῆτα*): but objection (1) remains.

because 'just' once meant 'good' in English.¹

Read, I think, ἐν δὲ τοῖσδε σός: 'but these men count me your true man.' Cf. *Ant.* 635 πάτερ, σός εἰμι. *O.C.* 1323-4, *E. El.* 898, 1103, *H.F.* 1113, *A. Eu.* 738 are also worth quoting. That the Schol. read ἴσος (interpreting it by παρὰ δὲ τοῖσδε τῆς ὁμοίας δόξης ἦν καὶ πρῶην εἶχον περὶ ἐμέ) does not prove it to be correct.

Jebb renders ἀγνώτος 'unperceiving,' active. But ἀγνώς can hardly = ἀσύνετος. I believe that it combines the meanings 'unknown' and 'unknowing' here: 'stranger.' Alienation pains Creon more than injustice.

O.T. 891-4.

Pearson (*C.Q.* XXIII 169) hardly meets Jebb's objections to ἔξεται. All the passages he cites are covered by 'maintain' (or 'get': Jebb of course knew this meaning, and for clearness' sake he might have mentioned it) 'grip on' or 'contact with.' He fails to justify 'ἔξεται = become involved with.' Why is ἀθίκτων θίξεται 'clumsy,' any more than μὴ κινεῖν τὰ κίνητα and the like? And why (on 894) does Pearson say that εὐχομαι meaning 'vows,' 'boasts' must take a future infinitive? The present is used here because the criminal vaunts that he always escapes, he cheats divine vengeance continually.

At 893 editors read βέλη θεῶν or θεῶν βέλη for θυμῷ (θυμοῦ) βέλη. But θυμοῦ βέλη, though, as Jebb says, it cannot mean 'shafts of divine wrath,' can surely

mean 'shafts that pierce his proud heart': for the genitive cf. *Ant.* 1085 καρδίας τοξεύματα. ψυχᾶς is hardly tautologous after θυμοῦ, which denotes the seat of the emotions: and the gloss τὴν θείαν δίκην is more needed to explain θυμοῦ βέλη than θεῶν βέλη.

971-2.

Jebb explains τὰ παρόντα θεσπίσματα as 'the oracles as they stand.' They may have been fulfilled 'in some indirect and figurative sense' (969-70), but certainly not 'to the letter.' But 'as they stand' would surely be ὥσπερ ἔχει, οἷάπερ πάρεστι, or the like. προδόντα Pearson, comparing *Cho.* 269. Now L. and S. cite as intransitive, 'fail,' *Hdt.* VII 187. 1 (a river run dry), VIII 52. 1 (a defence which proves inadequate): rather, perhaps, transitive, with object easily understood. But in all such cases the meaning is 'let down.' προδιδόναι is used of hopes that are dupes, not of fears that are liars. I think that τὰ παρόντα θεσπίσματα means 'the particular oracle under consideration': cf. τὸ παρόν, ὁ παρὼν λόγος, often used by the orators for 'the subject under discussion.' 'Why should one trust in oracles?' O. asks. 'They said I was to kill my father, and I have not, except perhaps in some casuistical sense. Well, anyhow, whether oracles in general are useless or not, this particular oracle is proved false.' δ' οὖν looks back, not to the quibble of 969-70, but to the note of general scepticism which opens the speech, and dominates it throughout, in spite of the particular reference to the death of Polybus which intervenes.

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College,
Oxford.

¹ I had overlooked *E. Supp.* 908; 'i.e. δίκαιον,' Murray: but both reading and interpretation seem to me highly doubtful (see Grégoire in the Budé edition).

SIMONIDES AND GLAUKOS.

It would appear to be the orthodox doctrine—as *steht geschrieben* in Schmid-Stählin, i, p. 507—that the earliest datable passage of Simonides is frag. 23 Diehl, 8 Bergk, written for Glaukos of Karystos in celebration of his victory at Olympia, 520 B.C. The argument looks conclusive at first sight; it is due to Meineke.

Lucian says (*pro imag.*, 19) that a well-reputed poet, ποιητῆς εὐδόκιμος, praised this Glaukos.

Quintilian says (*inst. orat.*, xi, 2, 14) that Simonides wrote an ode to Glaukos.

It is well known (the authorities are conveniently collected by Rutgers, *Sex. Iulii Africani ὀλυμπιάδων ἀναγραφή*,

pp. 25-6) that Glaukos won a boxing-match at Olymp. lxn, 520 B.C.

Therefore the fragment which Lucian preserves is from the ode by Simonides which celebrated this victory.

That Simonides wrote something sometime in honour of Glaukos I do not dispute, and that Lucian preserves a scrap of it is likely enough; what I deny is that the existing fragment can have been written in honour of that victory.

The words of Lucian are: ἀλλὰ πῶς ἐπήνεσε ποιητὴς εὐδόκιμος τὸν Γλαῦκον; οὐδὲ Πολυδεύκεος βίαν φήσας ἀνατείνασθαι ἂν αὐτῷ ἐναντίας τὰς χεῖρας οὐδὲ σιδάρεον Ἀλκμήνας τέκος. He is manifestly half-quoting, and the lines may well have run as Diehl prints them—

οὐδὲ Πολυδεύκεος βία
χεῖρας ἀντεῖναι¹ ἂν ἐναντίον αὐτῷ
οὐδὲ σιδάρεον Ἀλκμήνας τέκος.

I flatly deny that Simonides wrote these lines in commemoration of the event of 520. Glaukos was then a boy, albeit a very powerful one, with a punch of which his friends then, or anecdote-mongers afterwards, said that it could drive the coulter home into the plough.¹ It is true that 'boy' in the rough-and-ready Olympic classification might mean 'young man'; but even so, the upward limit of his age would be about nineteen.² That any poet of good taste should have said concerning even a strong and well-developed youth that the greatest of heroes and the patron deity of boxers would not have dared to withstand him is past belief. What may have been said, speaking of a great boxer in his prime, is something to the effect that 'if Glaukos had appeared at (the funeral games of Pelias, or some other heroic "meet" known from epic or Stesichoros) he would have been granted the prize for boxing, *hors concours*, because not even the mightiest of those days could have met him in the ring.' That would be pardonable hyperbole; the other would be such wild exaggeration as a Greek audience would hardly

have endured and Simonides certainly would not have written.

But we are not left to conjectures concerning the limits of good taste; Quintilian gives us a glimpse of the contents of the ode to Glaukos which he or his Greek authorities knew. After telling the well-worn story of how the Dioskuroi rescued Simonides because he had praised them, he goes on: *est autem magna inter auctores dissensio Glaucone Carystio an Leocrati an Agatharcho an Scopae scriptum sit id carmen*. Grammatically, this could be taken in two ways, that one ode was known in which there was much said in praise of the Dioskuroi, but it was uncertain to whom it was addressed, or that there were four odes, all saying something on the subject, and it was not sure which of them the deities found so acceptable. When we consider how much an epinikion always had to say about the victor himself, it is evident that the second is the correct interpretation; for it will not, I take it, be supposed that the poem in question was already lost. There existed, then, among the works of Simonides, as Quintilian knew them, or at all events, for Quintilian appears to have known him mostly as a composer of dirges,³ as his authorities knew them, a poem addressed to Glaukos of Karystos in which there was an episode (*more poetis frequentissimo digressus in laudes Castoris ac Pollucis exierat*) highly laudatory of the divine Twins. To equate this with an ode in which one of them was compared disadvantageously with a human athlete is about as sound as to argue: Shakespeare wrote a play with a comic Scots captain in it; Shakespeare wrote a play in which Scots appear in serious parts; therefore we may suppose that *Henry V* and *Macbeth* are alternative titles of the same drama.

I conclude, then, that whether or not Simonides celebrated Glaukos' victory of 520, we have no recognisable fragment of any poem relating to that event, unless Quintilian's reference be counted as such; the few words which

¹ Pausanias, vi, 10, 1 sqq.

² Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, p. 271.

³ *Inst. orat.*, x, 1, 64, *Simonides tenuis aliqui, etc., praecipua tamen eius in commendanda misericordia est.*

Lucian preserves, while probably by Simonides (for Pindar does not appear to have written for Glaukos and Bakchylides was rather young to have

done so), are not from that poem, but from some other of later date.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

PINDAR, O. 8, 53-64.

τερπνὸν δ' ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἴσον ἔσσεται οὐδέν.
εἰ δ' ἐγὼ Μελησία ἐξ ἀγενείων κῦδος ἀνέδραμον ὕμνῳ,
μὴ βαλέτω με λίθῳ τραχεῖ φθόνος·
καὶ Νεμέα γὰρ ὁμῶς
ἐρέω ταύταν χάριν,
τὰν δ' ἔπειτ' ἀνδρῶν μάχας
ἐκ παγκρατίου. τὸ διδάσσειναι δέ τοι
εἰδότες ῥάτερον· ἀγνωνῶν δὲ τὸ μὴ προμαθεῖν·
κουφότεραι γὰρ ἀπειράτων φρένες.
κεῖνα δὲ κείνος ἂν εἴποι
ἔργα περαιτέρων ἄλλων, τίς τρέπος ἀνδρὰ προβάσει
ἐξ ἱερῶν ἀέθλων μέλλοντα ποθεινοτάταν δόξαν φέρειν.

It is generally held that Pindar here feels that praise of Melesias (according to the scholia an Athenian) may arouse odium in Aegina, an old enemy of Athens. But even if Wilamowitz was wrong in conjecturing (*Pindaros*, p. 398, note) that the scholiast has confused Melesias with Menandros of Athens, φθόνος is better taken not as due to any such special circumstance but as a common result of praise, for fear of which Pindar regularly moderates his eulogies: cf. *O.* 2, 95; 13, 25; *P.* 1, 84-6; 8, 29-32; 11, 28-30; *N.* 10, 19-20; *I.* 1, 41-5; 2, 43-5. Here, too, 'nothing will be found to please all men alike' refers to the same tendency.

The train of thought in the rest of this passage as generally interpreted is not clear, especially in ll. 59 ff. 'To teach, as ye know, is easier for him that himself hath knowledge, while it is foolish, not to learn betimes. Flighty are the words of them that have made no trial': so Sandys, and similarly others. Certainly if ll. 56-8 meant that Melesias was a victor at Nemea in his youth, that might lend point to a statement that it is easier for one who knows to teach, though it is hard to believe that Pindar would devote two more sentences to a solemn proof thereof. But it is doubtful whether Melesias had been a victor: such a distinction would scarcely have been passed over in silence in *N.* 4, 94; and *N.* 6, 68 merely says that as the dolphin excels in speed so Melesias excels as ἀνίοχος, guide (i.e. trainer) of strength. Although

κῦδος ἐξ ἀγενείων means glory won not from training youths but from the vanquishing of youths, and merely defines the 'class' in which the candidate was entered at Olympia (cf. *O.* 9, 88 κῦδος ἀνδρῶν), nevertheless the trainer has, in Pindar, a special share of the credit for a boy's victory, and Pindar's words here quite naturally indicate the glory accruing to Melesias from his pupil's success in the defined competition. Then Pindar adds mention of exactly the same glory accruing to Melesias at Nemea too, and of a similar fame arising from a subsequent success (of a pupil) in a men's contest. In the light of l. 16 it is reasonable to conjecture that this is a reference to Melesias' having trained the brother Timosthenes for two victories at Nemea. This seems more relevant and intelligible than the usual interpretation, gives point to ὁμῶς (l. 56), and continues the tendency of l. 16 to make this ode an encomium of the family as well as the present victor.

If then these lines have nothing to do with victories won by Melesias himself, ll. 59-61 as usually translated become wholly platitudinous. Now Boeckh considered but rejected the translation, 'to get oneself taught is easier for one who has a natural talent.' This is a proper use of the middle διδάσκομαι (see e.g. Kühner³ § 376, 1 ad fin.), and probably has parallels in *Ar. Nubes* 111, 127, 194; in *Soph. Antig.* 355 ἐδιδάξατο, and in *Ar. Vesp.* 2 διδάσκομαι, are probably reflexive middles, though they may mean 'get oneself taught,' that is, by experience or the like, not by a personal teacher. Like the passive it often means little more than μανθάνειν. Boeckh's objections are not grammatical; he alleges incoherence and the impossibility of making εἰδώς mean φησὶ εἰδώς. His own explanation is forced, and assumes the early victories of Melesias, admitting

that Pindar would not write thus without something of the sort to give point to l. 59. 'Non nude ita accipiendum ut alipta debeat ipse exercitatus esse: quod per se patet: sed . . . hoc . . . vult: Qui quem ad sacrorum ludorum certamina (ἐξ ἱερῶν ἀθλῶν) instituere velit, debere ipsum ibi expertum esse, ut Melesiam'; and, apart from the facts about Melesias, this does nothing to relieve the frigidity remaining in ἀγνωμον . . . φρένες, as generally understood. Now of Boeckh's two objections the latter only is difficult to meet. But if μαθόντες (O. 2, 87), διδασκταῖς (O. 9, 100), and διδασκτά (N. 3, 41) can from their context take a special meaning, 'mere learning without a basis of natural talent,' here, although εἰδώς simpliciter cannot mean εἰδὼς φυᾶ, yet in contrast with διδάσασθαι, 'get instructed,' εἰδὼς can mean 'having knowledge not imparted by instruction, i.e. natural knowledge or talent.' As for the sense of the rendering now put forward, so far from being incoherent it seems positively required by Pindar's habitual train of thought. He always insists that for success in the games we need three things, natural talent, training to develop it, and the favour of heaven to bring it to a prosperous issue. He never exalts one of these requirements, certainly not the first or second, at the expense of the others. As commonly translated this passage ascribes an un-Pindaric (because unqualified) efficacy to one factor, the trainer. The usual Pindaric doctrine and manner of exposition are seen in O. 9, 100-8, where τὸ φυᾶ κράτιστον yet leads up to σοφίαι μὲν αἰπεῖναι, and indeed in almost every ode. The sense of our passage in O. 8 is exactly

parallel to O. 10, 19 ff., where, after complimentary mention of the trainer, the limitations and the utility of his office are nicely balanced: he can only 'whet' natural talent and 'speed it on' to success (cf., O. 8, προβάσει, and 'it is easier for one with natural talent to learn'): nevertheless few, if any, succeed without training (O. 10), and 'it is stupid not to take instruction before the contest, for the minds of the untried are too light' (O. 8); their talent has not been consolidated by experience and so needs training, cf. Frag. 227 (250). Thus κείνος and κείνα gain significance: κείνος means Melesias, not, as Puech renders, 'a man of that sort (= a teacher with knowledge),' which makes αὐτῷ in l. 65 very abrupt; and κείνα ἔργα implies, 'What Melesias knows is precisely this, what course will help the φυᾶ εἰδῶτα, the man destined for success'; μέλλοντα does not mean 'minded,' as the regular train of Pindaric thought shows.

'But nothing will be found to please all men alike. If I in my song have run up praise for Melesias from vanquished youths let not envy cast a rough stone at me. For I will mention this same honour won at Nemea too, and the following honour from fight with men, from the pancratium. To get oneself taught, doubtless, is easier for him that hath knowledge; and it is stupid not to take lessons before the contest; for the untried are too light-minded. And these tasks Melesias above others could tell, what course of training will bring on a man who is destined to win most coveted glory in the sacred games.'

P. B. R. FORBES.

University of Edinburgh.

SOPHRON AND THEOCRITUS: ADDENDUM.

(C.R. XLVII, p. 113.)

SINCE the publication of my note on his new fragment of Sophron, Professor Vitelli has kindly sent me a further article on the same theme (*Studi Italiani* 10, p. 247). Another scrap of the papyrus has been found and fitted to the first, so that the end of the fragment now reads as follows:

σβήτησπερεχει· ευκαμίαν
15 νυν παρεχθεῖς κεγαν
ποτῶνδε κταλεω
ποτνια· δει, ουμέντυκα[
[.]ερωναμεμφων ἄντ[
[.]ν, καικα, αμῶνδ[

I do not think the new lines shed much light on the question whether the fragment comes from *Ταὶ γυναῖκες αἱ τὰν θεὸν φαντὶ ἐξελάειν* and/or the mime imitated by Theocritus in *Id.* 2, but it is unfortunate that ll. 15 ff., which should explain what the speaker is doing, are extremely obscure. Eitrem interprets *ἀς κ' ἐγὼν | πὸτ τὰνδ' ἐπάκτ' ἀλεύσω* and translates, *that I may in the meantime be able to drive away the spell¹ from these women*; he feels, however, a very proper doubt about *πρὸς c. gen.* in such a sense. If I were compelled to translate these words, I should wonder whether they did not rather mean *until I have averted dangerous influences exerted by these (female powers, women, or feminine objects)*, and refer to the *φυλακτήριον* necessary for the protection of all persons who summon up dangerous powers. But, however that may be, let us not be misled into thinking *ἀλεύειν* a synonym of *ἐξελάειν* or drawing inferences therefrom.² Vitelli suggests *πὸτ τὰνδε πυκταλεύσω until I*

have sparred (with Hekate) in these ladies' interest. Not very convincing, certainly; and yet it would be odd, if a mere coincidence, that *πυκταλεύειν* should be cited from Sophron in *Et. Orion*. I can suggest no alternative, nor any means of connecting *πότνια* with this sentence as the punctuation invites. In what follows, since enclitic *τυ* must presumably be accusative, Vitelli writes *δείπνουν μὲν τυ καλέω καὶ | ξενίων ἀμειψέων ἀντιάσαν, or ἀντάσειν*. For the rest, *εὐκαμίαν*, of which the *μ* is apparently secure, exonerates Hesychius's gloss *εὐκαμία · ἡσυχία ἥτοι εὐφημία* from the justifiable suspicion under which it lay.

Vitelli publishes also another fragment of fifteen mutilated lines, from the same papyrus but apparently from another mime. Its contents are highly mysterious, but they furnish a curious parallel to Ammonius's puzzling citation of *πεῖ γὰρ ἄ ἀσφαλτος* (see p. 114); Clement (*Strom.* 4, p. 584) cites from Epicharmus *αὐτὰ φύσις ἀνθρώπων · ἀσκολι πεφυσάμενοι*. The words are unmetrical, and Wilamowitz guessed them to be Sophron's. The new fragment has, after a colon, *ασκοπεφυσάμ[ε]νοι*, but the preceding letters are *[*****]μες*.

A. S. F. GOW.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

'ANIMAMQVE SVPERBAM' AND OCTAVIAN.

REPLYING¹ to a note² which I had contributed on *animamque superbam*,³ a phrase applied by Vergil to the Brutus who recovered the *fascēs* from the last Tarquin, Professor R. S. Conway, having generously commended my main suggestions, deprecates my opinion⁴ that Vergil,⁵ in attributing to Aeneas the intention to sacrifice prisoners of war, sought to provide a precedent for the similar atrocity actually committed by Octavian.⁶ At the instance of Professor Conway himself I continue the discussion, in the hope of coming

nearer to the truth by the help which he has given.⁷

⁷ Professor Conway's explanation (which, though I considered the question, I missed) of the use of *anima*, as a word which means an unconscious psychological element, is especially useful. Since both the Bruti concerned here were supposed instinctively inclined to high-handed and cruel acts—a character proved for the later of them by history, as Professor Conway well recalls—, there is a particular point in the taunting appeals scratched, just before the assassination of Julius, on the statue of the elder Brutus [*εἶθε ἔζης* (Dio XLIV. 12. 3; cf. Plut. *Brut.* IX.)], and on the tribunal of the younger [*καθεύδεις, ὦ Βρούτιε*; and *Βρούτος οὐκ εἶ* (Dio, *ibid.*; cf. Plut. *ibid.*; App. *De bell. ciu.* II. 469 [cf. 472]; Suet. *Caes.* lxxx—passages collected by A. Stein, *Römische Inschriften in der antiken Literatur* [Prague, 1931], pp. 66 f.). Professor H. J. Rose kindly reminds me that the former Brutus was thought to be not only the enemy of the Tarquini, but also himself a

¹ In *C.R.* XLVI. (1932), pp. 199 ff.

² *Ibid.* pp. 55 ff.

³ Verg. *Aen.* VI. 817 f.

⁴ In *C.R.* XLVI. (1932), p. 57.

⁵ Verg. *Aen.* X. 517 ff.

⁶ Suet. *Aug.* XV., etc.

To Professor Conway it is incredible that Vergil could have contradicted his whole nature by condoning human sacrifice. I agree. Probably I should not have used the misleading word 'precedent' without further qualification; but otherwise I think my agreement not materially inconsistent with my published opinions. But I still believe that the action of Octavian accounts for the intention of Aeneas, which is otherwise inexplicable, just because the writer of the passage is Vergil. The passage is in fact a perfection of Vergilian ambiguity. The episode is Homeric;¹ it is nowhere said that Aeneas carried out his design;² and besides the design itself is conceived at a moment of great passion and righteous indignation.³ Vergil is so subtle and ingenious that he reflects the act of Octavian on to Aeneas without leaving any impression that Aeneas was really cruel or unscrupulous. The atrocity of Octavian is idealized almost out of recognition; as Cleopatra is idealized, in so far as she can be said to be reflected in Dido. We may therefore think, if we like, that Aeneas was right to conceive a noble passion of love for Dido, and another of indignation at the death of Pallas. He is to be more than human, not less; and so though he is tempted he tears himself away from Carthage, and, as we must imagine, spares the captives. Octavian was certainly meant to see his reflection in Aeneas; perhaps he

was also meant to forget the deeds which he had himself done, and to remember only that he like Aeneas had been tempted. Such a frame of mind might be useful.⁴ Vergil, believing rightly that Octavian might become the very leader for whom the Roman world was waiting, must have realized that to fulfil this possibility Octavian had first to recover his self-respect. Octavian could, when he read the *Aeneid*, even feel that his sins and the sins of others should be traced to the wickedness not of any individuals but of the times. This seems, in fact, according to Professor Conway's analysis,⁵ to have been almost Vergil's own belief. But at least it would have been useless for Vergil to begin the task of reclaiming Octavian by denouncing him as irreclaimable. Besides, the one hope, if the new dawn was to brighten into full day, was to forgive and to forget.

It is part of Vergil's subtlety that he leaves his readers to interpret the *Aeneid* each in his own way. We are not compelled to regard the intention of Aeneas to sacrifice prisoners as Octavian was likely to regard it. We may think that the mere desire of such a deed is unpardonable; Vergil is careful to give no hint that he himself approved, though he is equally careful to leave Octavian at complete liberty to derive from the incident edifying consolation. When the *Aeneid* was being written, propaganda was intense; so intense that it has almost falsified for ever historical facts concerning Antonius, Cleopatra, and the battle of Actium.⁶ It is incredible that Vergil could have renounced all share in it; for it was necessary in order to establish the new régime in which he firmly

Tarquin on his mother's side (Liv. I. 56. 7), so that it was the more natural for Vergil to classify both Brutus and the last Tarquin together as tyrannical.

¹ The 'precedent' was 'legendary' in a full sense; I do not mean of course that it was designed as an example to be followed, or that the deed was to be sanctioned by any reverence due to antiquity. Clearly, in the past of poetry, evil and good are both idealized and magnified. The legendary quality seems to me to make the parallel more remote from common experience, so that even the comparison between the act of Octavian and the intention of Aeneas need not be obvious.

² I was careful to say '... since Octavianus had sacrificed human beings, Aeneas must certainly ... be ready to do so too' [in C.R. XLVI. (1932), p. 57], not '... must certainly do so too.'

³ R. S. Conway, *Vergil's Creative Art* (London, 1930), pp. 12 ff.

⁴ I attach considerable importance to the indication given by Seneca, who (*De Clement.* I. xi. 1), writing of the perpetration of human sacrifice, says that Augustus hated the memory of his crime and was a very different man in later years.

⁵ In C.R. XLVI. (1932), p. 201, where he refers to Vergil's opinion of the *impia saecula*, and his conviction that when men act so, disaster must always follow.

⁶ W. W. Tarn in *J.R.S.* XXI. (1931), pp. 173 ff., especially 182 f., 196 ff.; cf. Tarn in *C.Q.* XXVI. (1932), pp. 75 ff., especially p. 80 note 10 cont. p. 81, and p. 81. Cf. Suet. *Claud.* XLI.

believed. How he was affected by the need for propaganda, in contrast with others, perhaps even with Horace, who also sincerely tried to exert a good influence, is one of the proofs of Vergil's greatness, humanity and prophetic vision. Without adulation or connivance in past wrong, he set an idealized Augustus into an artistic pattern of all existence, and first conciliated, and then by the power of his genius inspired, the real prototype.⁷

W. F. J. KNIGHT.

Bloxham School.

⁷ Professor Conway's view of 'the power which genius has of penetrating to the truth and stamping it on other men's minds' seems to me incontrovertible. He has surely proved it, for Vergil's power over Octavian, in *Poetry and Government* (Manchester, 1928), especially pp. 6 ff., 19 ff. Neither Shakespeare (to whom Professor Conway refers) nor Vergil (although his poetry is 'allegorical' in some sense in which Shakespeare's is not) approved of the crimes of their characters. On the other hand, it may be misleading to consider whether an artist intends us to admire his characters as moral individuals or not [G. Wilson Knight, *The Imperial Theme* (London, 1930), pp. 19 ff., etc.]. Probably in the most relevant sense

Vergil's Aeneas, Dido, Turnus and Allecto are all equally admirable. The artist himself does not argue; and, in the category of pure art a sin seems rather something to be understood than something to be condemned, for in this category condemnation is pointless. Vergil in particular takes us to 'a world where it would be strange not to forgive.' I do not argue, of course, that artists are without approval or disapproval for the actions of their characters, and still less do I suggest that moral facts are not of the utmost importance in art. According to Croce, a work of art is a creative representation of 'a world desired or a world abhorred' by the artist. But the artist allows the ethical colour, which, for him, his material bears, to emerge from the vital essence which he himself instils into that material. He does not overlay the ethical colour extrinsically. In the incident of the prisoners of war Vergil shows by his artistic treatment that even after terrible thoughts Aeneas can be forgiven; and Octavian might if he chose be reassured that, though he himself had actually fallen to temptation, there could be forgiveness for him also.

P.S.—This note was in proof when Professor Conway died. I leave it as it was, because he had seen it, and liked it. But I cannot help mentioning here the reverence for him and the sorrow which I share with many, and my own immense debt both to his boundless personal kindness and to his work.

Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit,
nulli flebilior quam tibi, Vergili.

ANCIENT CHEMICAL WARFARE.

MR. RODERICK MCKENZIE's reading of *χειροσίφωνα*, in a fragment of Leo Africanus (C.R., February, 1933), is very simple and elegant; it makes sense of the passage, and points the way to further elucidation. We are shown how easily cavalry may be stampeded by the trick of squirting a certain substance into the horses' nostrils: *πρὸς φύγην δὲ ῥαδίως οἱ ἵπποι τρέπονται, ἂν τινες . . . χειροσίφωνα κατέχοντες, χυλὸν εὐφορβίου ἔχοντα, τοῖς μυκῆσιν τῶν ἵππων ἐμβάλωσιν*. But what was this *χυλὸς εὐφορβίου*; what were its properties; and with what sort of a squirt was it used?

The many species of *Euphorbia* are poisonous plants, some more, some less so, and secrete a milky, acrid juice which dries hard like resin. One species (*E. hiberna*) is used by poachers in South-West Ireland to poison fish; certain others are dreaded in South Africa for the angry wounds their prickles cause; and one, *E. resinifera*,

a cactus-like plant growing in Morocco and North Africa, has had its place in the pharmacopoeia since the days of Dioscorides and before, and is said to be still used in veterinary and, though rarely, in human medicine. Its dust is described (in Thorpe's *Dictionary of Applied Chemistry*) as 'causing violent and even dangerous irritation to the nose or throat.' This is the very plant which Pliny describes (25, 38), and on which King Juba had written a whole book. It was 'tapped' like indiarubber: 'incisae conto, subditis excipulis ventriculo haedino, humor lactis videtur effluere; siccatus cum coit, turis effigiem habet.' It had good qualities as well as bad; but the least taste of the juice inflamed the mouth, and the pain got worse and worse as time went on: 'etiam levi gustu os accensum diu detinens, et magis ex intervallo donec fauces quoque siccet.' It is without doubt the plant whose use in war, by means of the

χειροσίφων, Leo Africanus describes and recommends.

We may use a squirt to throw a jet of water, a flame of fire, a cloud of dust. A water-squirt would be of little use on the field of battle—it would be emptied in a moment; the Euphorbia-juice would not mix with water, and would be far too scanty to fill a squirt of itself; moreover, if one could manage to squirt water up a horse's nose no superadded drug would be required!

The military *χειροσίφων* was often used as a 'Flammenwerfer,' throwing Greek Fire; it was so in the passage which Mr. McKenzie quotes from Leo Africanus: *ρίψουσι γὰρ καὶ αὐτὰ τοῦ ἐσκευασμένου πυρὸς κατὰ τῶν προσώπων τῶν πολεμίων*. Ducange (s.v. *σιφονάτωρ*) quotes other passages to the same effect: one where Leo Isaurus speaks of *σιφῶνας πυρσοφόρους*: another where Michael Curopalata tells of the *σιφῶνας χαλκοῦς*, throwing out 'liquid fire'; and a third in which Leo Tacticus describes a naval attack, where one man hooks on the grappling-iron and another directs the spurt of flame. But in our passage there is no word of fire; and we come easily to the conclusion that the squirt was used to puff a cloud of fine dust, the dried and powdered juice or resin of *Euphorbia resinifera*. Now we may remember how M. Panurge had many pockets in his coat, and something mischievous in them all: 'En une aultre, il avoit tout plein de euphorbe pulverisé bien sub-

tilement, et là dedans mettoit un mouschenez beau et bien ouvré. . . . Et quand il se trouvait en compagnie de quelques bonnes dames . . . il tiroit son mouschenez . . . et le secouait bien fort à leur nez, et les faisait esterner quatre heures sans repos.' Whether Rabelais, who knew everything, was acquainted with the true text of Leo Africanus, we cannot be sure.

There is nothing new under the sun: and it is interesting to learn (e.g. from Fries and West's *Chemical Warfare*, 1921, p. 181) that 'sternutators,' or forms of 'sneezing gas' were used during the War, just as Euphorbia-dust had been used by Africanus and his men. One of these peculiar chemicals (diphenylchloroarsine), a solid substance, was fired in an explosive shell and so shattered into the finest possible dust and scattered widely. Diffused in air to the extent of one part in ten millions (!) it caused violent sneezing and intolerable burning pains; in a concentration of one part in two hundred thousand it caused dangerous vomiting; its minute particles even penetrated the ordinary gas-masks. It is said that, towards the end of the war, it was sent over as a preliminary dose, to make men sneeze their gas-masks off! It was followed up, five minutes later, by a true 'poison-gas,'—and military chemistry reaped its full reward.

D'ARCY WENTWORTH THOMPSON.
University of St. Andrews.

REVIEWS

THE TECHNIQUE OF EARLY GREEK SCULPTURE.

The Technique of Early Greek Sculpture.

By STANLEY CASSON. Pp. xiv + 246;
68 plates, 28 illustrations in the text.
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.
Cloth, 25s.

THIS book claims to be the only work in any European language on its subject. This claim is justified, for Blümel's *Griechische Bildhauerarbeit* is primarily concerned with the period after 450 B.C., which is Mr. Casson's

lower limit; and even for the later period Blümel is in no sense definitive, and it is to be hoped that Mr. Casson will go further and produce companion volumes for the later periods of Greek and Graeco-Roman sculpture. This is then a work of great importance, and with the help of a grant from the Derby Trustees has been worthily produced. Binding, printing, and illustrations are above reproach; the wealth of detailed

photographs which are essential in a work of this kind admirably illustrate Mr. Casson's points. The work is in two parts. Mr. Casson first considers the development of technique historically from Minoan Crete and the Cyclades to the Olympian pediments: he deals with hard and soft stones separately, and adds chapters on relief and bronze work. In the second part he gives a detailed account of the tools which are used. Between the two parts is a chronological table, which shows at what dates certain tools were introduced: the most important points seem to be the primary use of abrasive tools from 1700 to 450 B.C., the introduction of the flat chisel for secondary uses in 650, the introduction of the claw chisel, gouge, and drill in 550-40 B.C. It will be seen from the above that the book is a mine of detailed information. Among other things this information may have important results in determining whether a work is genuine or not. On p. 5 the proof from technique that the Minoan statuette in the Fitzwilliam Museum is a forgery seems perfectly convincing; it is a pity that Mr. Casson does not also consider the question of the authenticity of the archaic group at Munich, though it may be that its surface is too badly weathered for the certain application of the technical argument. There are a few criticisms to be made. The discussion of the existence and survival of pre-Hellenic statues and the account of the earliest Hellenic statues is extremely important (p. 50 ff., p. 155 ff.); but Buschor's evidence for an eighth-century cult-statue in Samos should have been quoted (*Ath. Mitt.*, 1930, p. 17). P. 60, n. 1: 'there is no evidence to suggest that wall paintings existed in temples of the "geometric" period,' but it is a fair inference from the highly-developed pictorial art of the Dipylon vases. P. 63: ἔδος need not mean a seated statue. P. 66: 'For the date of the earliest large stone statues we have no literary evidence at all,' yet the pedigree of the Daedalic school can be established with some accuracy, and the attribution of the early Cretan

sculptures to Daedalus or his contemporaries seems certain (Rumpf, *Bonner Jahrb.*, cxxxv., p. 78). P. 71: the scale pattern on the breast of the lady of Auxerre is cut with a compass. Secondly, in the preface Mr. Casson says that the historical method, coupled with a balanced judgment of style, still makes it difficult for the observer to grasp the intentions of the maker; this can be gained by a close study of technique. For him, though he admits certain exceptions (pp. 104, 116, 125), technique normally controls style, and the sculptor is the servant of his tools. Therefore Mr. Casson has no patience with those critics who compare sculpture and painting (p. 144). But it is just in Greek art that it is particularly easy to see the parallelism in general stylistic outlook between sculpture and painting at any given moment; nor can I really believe that the Ionian sculptor's exquisite sense of variation in material (e.g. chiton, himation, veil in the 'Hera' of Cheramyes) was in any sense the result of the association of Naxian emery stone with Naxian marble, as Mr. Casson implies (p. 103). The Argive and Attic sculptors of the sixth century, and the sculptors of high and low relief achieved different styles by using different tools: in both cases Mr. Casson says that the ultimate difference is one of technique (pp. 108, 139); I should say that the sculptor wanted to do something different and therefore used different tools. I do not deny for a moment the importance of the study of technique or the great value of this particular contribution to it, but I cannot see how Mr. Casson gets nearer to the sculptor's intentions by saying that he used an emery stone instead of a chisel than I do by saying that he was more interested in surface than volume. Finally, two small points: p. 20, Lampon in Pindar, *Isth.* vi. 72 is probably not a 'strong man' but a trainer, an even better sense (Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, p. 186, n. 2); p. 20, n. 3 and 4, the quotations seem to have been transposed.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

THE CATALOGUE OF THE SHIPS.

Die Einschaltung des Schiffkatalogs in die Ilias. F. JACOBY. Pp. 48. (Sonderausgabe aus den Szb. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Ph.-Hist. Kl. 1932.) Berlin: de Gruyter, 1933. Paper, RM. 3.

THE Catalogue of Ships has provoked angry passions in the past, but now it presents a spectacle almost unique in the world of Homeric scholarship. Nearly everyone, whatever his views on other aspects of the Homeric question, agrees that it is not the work of the man who composed the *Iliad*. Starting from this welcome unanimity Jacoby faces the special problem of its inclusion in the *Iliad* and reaches some interesting results. His conclusion is that the Catalogue was inserted into a more or less complete *Iliad* by some poet who was not its author nor the author of the *Iliad*, and who took great pains to make his insertion artistic. He flanked the Catalogue fore and aft with similes and invocations of the Muses, and he inserted the speech of Nestor in *B* to prepare the way for it. Jacoby is not concerned with who the interpolator was or even with the historicity and origin of the Catalogue. He accumulates his evidence to show that the Catalogue is posterior to the rest of the poem, and with characteristic skill he explains what happened when it was inserted.

In all this there is much sound sense and learning. Jacoby is never carried away by wild theories, and each step in his argument is thoughtful and well argued. With his main contention that the Catalogue is an insertion there can be no quarrel, but it is surely possible that the insertion was made by Homer. It is true that the Catalogue is from some points of view out of place, but it is no more out of place than Agamemnon's ἐπιπῶλσις or the τεύχοςκοπία. It is true that as an index to the *Iliad* it is inadequate, that it betrays its alien origins—not, however, as Jacoby well shows, in the *Cypria*—, that it delays

the action. But these considerations are irrelevant in a poem compiled for piecemeal recitation. The Catalogue was a historical document of repute, and its inclusion in the *Iliad* was made because of its antiquity and interest. It follows that the insertion, so ably explained by Jacoby, may have been Homer's work. The similes and the invocations are in his manner, and the speech of Nestor prepares the way for it. It is, of course, possible that Homer expanded his epic as he grew older, and then the Catalogue would belong to his later period. Such awkwardnesses as its inclusion produced are no greater than many others forced on Homer by his rehandling of old material.

The Trojan Catalogue presents a different problem. It lies outside the 'frame' made for the Achaean Catalogue, and Jacoby's decision is that its inclusion was later and was forced by the Achaean Catalogue, which demanded an opposite number. He is himself inclined to think that it is 'ein vorhandenes Gedicht,' and most critics will agree with him. It is certainly true that, once the Achaean Catalogue was in the *Iliad*, the Trojan Catalogue was demanded by elementary considerations of composition. Jacoby then points out a genuine distinction, too often ignored, between the interpolation of 'Einzelgedichte' and 'Umdichtung oder Bearbeitung,' and attributes the speech of Phoenix in *A* to the second class. This distinction is important, because even if we attribute considerable work to Homer, we have still to consider what material he used and what types of poetry he had in his mind when composing. The fundamental question is whether these changes and interpolations reveal the work of many hands or whether their detection takes us into Homer's own methods of work. And to this question we hope that Jacoby will soon give his answer.

C. M. BOWRA.

Wadham College, Oxford.

THE CONFEDERACY OF DELOS.

Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der delisch-attischen Symmachie. Von HERBERT NESSELHAUF. Pp. vii + 144. (Klio, Beiheft XXX; Neue Folge, Heft 17.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1933. Paper, M. 8.80.

NESSELHAUF'S aim is to review the epigraphical evidence for the Confederacy of Delos, augmented by the recent publication of the quota-lists by West and Meritt, and to assess the relation of this with the other evidence for the history of the Confederacy during the years 454-421 B.C. He has combined a thorough examination of problems with a clear and attractive exposition, affording concise summaries of relative evidence, and the work is a valuable contribution to the study of this period; it is worthy of notice that he has arrived independently at the same conclusions as Meritt (*Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century*) in dating the assessment of period VIII to 428 B.C. and assigning I.G. I² 216/7 + 231 and I² 218 to one assessment period, and with Tod (*A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, p. 55) in estimating the *maxima* in different periods. In the first chapter, From Symmachy to ἀρχή, good reasons are given for dating the change from payment in ships to payment in money to the period before the battle of Eurymedon (contrary to West's thesis), and the cause of the increase in paying members at the end of period I is found in the gradual recovery of Athens after the Egyptian disaster; this last event is dated to 454 B.C., but the argumentation against Taeger is far from conclusive. By obtaining an average, despite lacunae, for the lists of this period, he shows that the island-group was the most remiss in payment during period I—a conclusion fortified by the reduction in 450 B.C. of the assessment for the island members. In period II it is satisfactorily proved that I.G. I² 198 part 2 belongs to 449/8 B.C., and the peace with Persia and the Panhellenic Congress summoned by Athens should be dated to 448 B.C.; this leads to interesting conclusions with regard to the variations in the quota-lists and Athe-

nian policy in 448-446 B.C. In chapter 2, Die Blütezeit der athenischen ἀρχή, an unconvincing attempt (e.g. I² 200 Col. 1 [2]—17 = Ionian cities on the evidence only of [Κολοφώνιοι, the explanation of I² 201, and the interpretation of Plut. *Per.* 17) is made to date the division into districts to 446 B.C., and the junction of Ionia and Caria is dissociated from the Samian revolt; we have on the other hand a valuable treatment of the quota-lists and special classes, and of Athenian commercial policy. The chapter closes with the dating of West's 434 B.C. assessment to 435 B.C., the entry Ὀθόριοι ἀτακτοὶ being given more weight than the presence of the rubrics. For the first years of the War, in the third chapter, on the interpretation of προτέροις Παναθηναίοις as the Παναθηναία of the preceding year, he dates assessments to 431, 428, 425 and 421-0 B.C.; and uses the quota-lists to explain the policy of Pericles and the problem of finance. We come next to Die Phorosveränderungen von 454-431 B.C., a comparison by districts of the tribute for periods I, IV, and VI, and the variations are clearly correlated to historical events; one interesting conclusion is that variations inside a district are compensatory, so that the group-total may be maintained (e.g. the cases of Thasos and Aegina). The total revenue of 600 talents in Thucydides is accepted, the excess over 460 talents (the figure on which the different assessments were in Nesselhauf's view based) being supplied by revenue from state property.

An appendix deals with the Colonies and Cleruchies of 448-446 B.C., to which years with Busolt he dates the latter, and demonstrates that these foundations did not necessarily entail reassessment; the localisation of Brea is attempted and the planting of cleruchies at Chalcis and Eretria in 446 B.C. refuted. Finally a Nachtrag, referring to West, *op. cit.*, and indices complete a very useful and constructive volume of researches.

N. G. L. HAMMOND.

Clare College, Cambridge.

ATHENIAN FINANCIAL DOCUMENTS.

Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century. By B. D. MERITT. Pp. 192; 36 photos and 6 facsimile drawings. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1932. Cloth, \$3.50.

In this book Professor Meritt has followed up his brilliant work on the auditors' report and the tribute lists by re-editing a further considerable section of the first volume of the *Corpus*: the work was badly needed and could not have been in better hands. He begins with a reconsideration of the war tribute lists, and connects the tribute-collecting squadrons mentioned by Thucydides with new assessments in 430, 428 and 425: *S.E.G.* v. 29 is then shown by internal evidence to date from 427, and *S.E.G.* v. 25 and 28 are both assigned to the 430 assessment, the former to 428, the latter to 429. He then carries back Professor Ferguson's cycle of secretaries of the treasurers of Athena from 434 to 443 and uses it together with the form of the records for a much more reasonable ordering of the accounts of the Gold and Ivory Statue. The largest part of the book is naturally devoted to the accounts: the scattered work of other epigraphists is assembled and re-examined, new readings suggested, and dates more clearly defined. The new text for the accounts of the Samian war is perhaps the most revolutionary. Meritt separates the first payment from the second and third, and interprets it as expenditure on a campaign against Byzantium: the expenses recorded for Samos then correspond to the literary evidence, and the final sum is the total for both Samos and Byzantium. In *I.G.* 1² 298 the first payment from Athena's money during the rule of the Four Hundred sinks from 77 to 27 talents: the isolated *τὰ ἐξ Σάμο* in the accounts of 410/09 is given a respectable pedigree by the restoration of similar phrases in the accounts of 418/7 and 414/3: the *πάπιδροι* are removed from the accounts of 432/1. Finally, Meritt revises his previous text of the auditors' report and returns to problems of the calendar.

He modifies some of his former views in the light of criticism and new readings, but argues convincingly against Dinsmoor's identification of the Metonic solar year with the conciliar year. The most important *parergon* of this part of the book is the removal of *I.G.* 1² 105 from 411/0. Meritt shows that Wilhelm's restorations are difficult epigraphically, that the conditions implied by the decree are consistent with a later date, and reads in l. 2 *Ἀντιγένης* for *Θεόπομπος* as the archon's name. The decree recorded by Andocides can now mean what it says, and the restoration of complete democracy be definitely dated to the beginning of the conciliar year 410/9.

An important work of this type loses much of its value if the publishers insist on rigorous economy: they have here been refreshingly extravagant. The restored texts are justified and illustrated by facsimile drawings and a generous supply of photos. These are admirably clear and make it possible to control a large proportion of the new readings proposed. The book in fact is a model for scholars and publishers, and, as a model, remarkably cheap.

As these texts will be the necessary basis for future discussion and restoration, a few points may here be suggested. In *I.G.* 1² 296 (p. 80) the certain reading *Διοτίμο Φεγαίεύς* in l. 2 involves a shortening of the prescript; but surely it would be better to read *Ποτείδαίαν* than *Πελοπόννησον* in l. 1: the accounts of 432/1 would then be arranged in two distinct halves geographically—the first half devoted to Macedonia and Potidaea; the second, with separate prescript, to the squadron sailing round the Peloponnese. In the same inscription, l. 5, *φσεφισαμένο τὸ δέμο* may be reasonably suspected in view of its absence from the Corcyra document: the line could be filled out by the restoration of Eucrates' colleagues. In dating the war tribute lists, Meritt seems to have underestimated the general considerations in favour of putting *S.E.G.* v. 25 before 28. Not only

are the Bottic towns, Aeoleum and Pleume, present in the first and absent in the second: three other Thraceward towns (Bergae, Galepsus, Neapolis) are absent also in *S.E.G.* v. 28. It is difficult to believe that the Athenian hold on this district should be considerably weaker in 429 after the capture of Potidaea than in 428 after the failure before Spartolus. Nor do the arguments which led Meritt to reverse the natural order seem conclusive. That

Πυγελῆς in *S.E.G.* v. 28 only paid arrears of ἐπιφορά does not necessarily prove that the list is the first of an assessment period; and the tribe of the secretary of the hellenotamiae in *S.E.G.* v. 28 becomes of no importance as evidence if the cycle which can only be proved as far as 432/1 was discontinued before 430/29. On p. 175 one hundred talents is a slip for one thousand talents. R. MEIGGS.

Keble College, Oxford.

WEINSTOCK'S *SOPHOKLES*.

HEINRICH WEINSTOCK: *Sophokles*. Pp. 297. Berlin and Leipzig: Teubner, 1931. Bound, RM. 14; unbound, 12.

It would be a mistake to disregard this work because it has no learned footnotes and few references to the work of other scholars. On the contrary, the author's straightforward and systematic account of the seven plays is in effect a commentary, and a good one, lucid, honest and accurate in detail. It has the outstanding merit that it treats Sophocles seriously as an interpreter of life—far more seriously than many more pretentious works of professional scholarship. The author makes no parade of erudition, and his book is readable. But he has a good knowledge of Greek, and, as regards the *Ajax*, at any rate, and the *Philoctetes* and the two *Oedipus* plays, he seems to me to be a sound and sometimes a brilliant interpreter of the poet's thought. He is quite free both from the deplorable old tendency to treat the dramatist's artistic 'serenity' as a proof of indifference to moral and religious problems, and from the ridiculous new fashion of denying Sophocles the power, and even the will, to create living characters 'in the round.' As a pupil of Wilamowitz, returning to Greek studies after the experiences of the war, Mr. Weinstock found in Sophocles a profound and an inspiring teacher, who has interpreted anew, for him at any rate, the meaning of our tragic life, as revealed in personality at grips with circumstance. That fact alone, whatever one may think of Mr. Weinstock's

own interpretation, makes the book worth respect.

And yet the treatment of the heroines in this book leaves me uneasy. Mr. Weinstock's account of Electra, for example, though it is far removed from the stupidity which has attributed to Sophocles the monstrous notion of a happy play about 'matricide without tears,' seems gravely to underestimate both the humanity and the religious insight of Sophocles. He is faithful in his account of the earlier scenes, and well explains the tragic dilemma of a woman forced by loyalty to sacrifice, and consciously to sacrifice, her womanly instincts. He has every right to insist that by such sacrifice Electra wins personality, achieves a tragic grandeur. But he accepts too readily the common view, which is in fact a libel upon Sophocles, that the matricide was god-commanded, and Orestes wholly justified and the Chorus right when it chanted triumph and deliverance at the ghastly end. Electra, it is true, is noble in her ἀμαρτία. But, like everyone else in the play, she is the victim of a false creed, a false loyalty. What makes the tragedy most poignant is the fact that, being naturally fine, she is entangled by her circumstances and her creed in an abominable series of emotions which inevitably lead to spiritual ruin for herself as well as for the brother whom she loves. It is not Electra, but Antigone who is right in heart and head. It is significant that Mr. Weinstock whittles down Antigone's noblest utterance,

ὅς τοι συνέχθειν ἄλλὰ συμφυλαῖν ἔφην,

M

to the cold, false doctrine that a woman 'as a woman' has no concern with the political strife of men, but 'has only to care for the family.' It is significant and it is most regrettable. Mr. Weinstock, having thus diminished the stature of Antigone and of the poet who created her, calmly adds 'Genau dasselbe Wort hätte auch Elektra, die hasserfüllte Rächlerin von sich sagen können.' As a whole, his book is clearly the fruit of thought and of conviction.

One can only hope, with all respect, that he will think again about Electra and Antigone—for indeed humanity has, as he tells us, much to learn from Sophocles still: and of the lessons he can teach none is more urgent in our present peril and distress than that Antigone was right, Electra tragically, although not ignobly, wrong.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

King's College, Cambridge.

MURRAY'S ARISTOPHANES.

Aristophanes: A Study. By GILBERT MURRAY. Pp. x + 268. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

PROFESSOR MURRAY'S writings on Ancient Greek Literature are never entirely detached from the interests of the present day, nor, more particularly, from those with which he is personally associated; and this is true of this, his latest, volume, a study of Aristophanes as a poet mainly interested in 'Peace, Poetry and the Philosophic Criticism of Life.' Few have worked more strenuously for Peace, or contributed more to the understanding of Poetry, or studied more sincerely those ideals which are or should be implicit in sound education and the Good Life than the writer of this book; and as in many respects the problems connected with these things in Aristophanes' day resemble very closely those which face the present generation, the result is a study of Aristophanes which is singularly fresh and alive, and gives a presentation of the poet's aims and achievements which is fundamentally true and always illuminating. A large number of modern parallels and illustrations, apt and often witty, increase the sense that in studying Aristophanes we are not wasting time upon dead issues. It is unnecessary to add that the book is written with that charm and appropriateness of language which we all associate with the writer, and that the translations of passages from Aristophanes which occur up and down the book are ingenious and delightful. There may be some who will feel that here and

there a point is overstressed in consequence of a certain natural bias in the writer himself. It is natural that the Chairman of the League of Nations Union should insist that Aristophanes 'hated the War because it was War' (p. 136), whereas it is perhaps truer to say that he did indeed hate that particular War intensely, but nevertheless admired the men of Marathon and Salamis, as many modern workers for peace nevertheless admire Drake and Nelson. It is natural also that the translator and interpreter of Euripides can hardly believe that Aristophanes really meant to be unkind to Euripides, or to Socrates, with whom Euripides had much in common; and that one who has always championed the rights of women should minimize Aristophanes' hints at their failings—the wine to which they were addicted was after all no stronger than tea. But if we could find passages in the poet which it would be hard to bring into conformity with these views, the error is a kindly one, and helps to correct the opposite bias which most writers on the subject have shown. Professor Murray really understands what it is that Aristophanes cares about, and helps us to appreciate many passages and some characters who do not always receive justice from critics. The summary accounts of Aristophanes' career and of his qualities in Ch. IX are entirely true, and the brief history in the same chapter of the appreciation of the poet at different periods and the causes of a want of appreciation in some is very valuable. On this, as in some other

matters, Aristotle, no less than 'Plutarch,' appears to have been rather deficient in historical imagination. Other very convincing passages in the book are the explanation (which seems to be in some respects new) of the change of mind of the Athenian people in regard to Mytilene (p. 24), the insistence on the Athenian tolerance of unpopular opinion (p. 31), the description of the essential difference between the ideals of Cleon and of Aristophanes (p. 50), the differentiation between the political attitude of Aristophanes and that of the crowd of comic poets (p. 66), and the characterization of Lysistrata (p. 178). The concluding chapter on Menander is admirable in every way.

It may seem ungracious to append a few notes on points in which the reviewer finds something to criticize, but they are not points which at all seriously affect the value of the book:

(1) While no doubt the origin of some of the indecencies in Greek Comedy is partly to be explained by the derivation of certain elements in Comedy from some phallic ritual or other, there seems in fact to be no evidence that the particular type of ritual—a *κῶμος* followed by a *γάμος*—by which Professor Murray (following Professor Cornford) explains them, ever actually existed; and his references to origins include no reference to the undoubted Dorian antecedents of Attic Comedy, which seem to explain a good deal. I have discussed these matters at length elsewhere, and the final scenes which are referred to the supposed ritual *γάμος* have, I think, another explanation; but there is no known phallic rite of ancient Greece which offers exactly what is wanted to explain Comedy.

(2) The inscription of the Iobacchoi, referred to on p. 6, is very late (about 170 A.D.), and can hardly be used to illustrate the sentiments of classical times, though the point illustrated, the gradual refinement of the coarser features of Dionysiac ritual, is, of course, true and important. The Iobacchoi were a highly respectable club; today they would probably be a branch of the Church of England Men's Society,

or, at worst, of the Salvation Army (without its noisiness).

(3) There seems to be really more serious and even bitter criticism of Socrates in the *Clouds* than the mere 'clash of humours,' which Professor Murray thinks to have been here Aristophanes' interest, can explain, and perhaps more blending than he will allow of the features of a traditional type of character (the *ἀλαζὼν σοφός*) with those of the real Socrates. The difficulty is that we do not really know what Socrates was like in his early days, nor exactly at what time the study of τὰ μετέωρα came to carry a suspicion of atheism with it. But in the main the explanation given (pp. 99, etc.) of the importance attached by Plato in 399 to Aristophanes' criticisms is clearly right. 'In 423 these charges were jokes. In 399 they were not jokes at all. . . . A phrase that was a harmless jest in 423 might easily become deadly denunciation in 399.'

(4) The account given of the *Babyloniads* suffices to illustrate the writer's main point, the attitude of Aristophanes towards the imperial policy of Athens, but does not refer to the part which, apparently, Dionysus played in the plot. (Professor Norwood, in his *Greek Comedy*, pp. 282 ff., gives an entirely different reconstruction of the play.) Minute students might have been grateful for a reference to Rostagni's discussions of this play and the *Banqueters* (*Riv. di Fil.*, 1925). Is there any real difficulty in believing that Aristophanes was only seventeen when he composed the last-named play? Not a few Sixth Form boys at some great schools have done as good things in their time.

(5) The statement (p. 111) that neither Euripides nor any tragic poet 'dressed his beggared and outcast kings in rags,' etc., is surely a slip. Cf. Eur. *Helena*, l. 554, where Helen says to Menelaus καὶ μὴν στολήν γ' ἄμορφον ἀμφὶ σῶμ' ἔχεις, and l. 1079, where Menelaus refers to τὰδ' ἀμφίβληστρα σώματος ῥάκη. If Menelaus, why not Telephus and Oeneus also?

One other small point—not a criticism. In the note on p. 2, illustrating the limitations of the 'Release' which is part of the Spirit of Comedy, it

might have been added that Apollo, Artemis and Demeter, the deities for whom were felt the deepest religious emotions of the Greeks, occur in no Comedy, and when they are mentioned it is with respect; and that in plays

such as the *Ἀθηνᾶς Γοναί* of Hermippus the butt was probably Zeus, not Athena.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

University of Sheffield.

GOD IN GREEK PHILOSOPHY.

God in Greek Philosophy to the Time of Socrates. By ROY KENNETH HACK, B.Litt.(Oxon.). Pp. x + 160. Princeton University Press (London: Milford), 1931. Cloth, 13s. 6d.

THIS is a stimulating re-examination of the central problem in pre-Socratic philosophy. The interest shown by Plato and Aristotle in 'divine reality' and the 'succession of the doctrines' of the pre-Socratic philosophers themselves become intelligible, it is claimed, only if the latter were not 'attempting first of all to found natural science' but rather 'to improve the definition of the nature of the supreme divine power.' 'The continuity of Greek thought about the supreme god was never really broken' (p. vi.). Continuity there undoubtedly was, but not quite of the kind suggested by Professor Hack. For Homer and Hesiod the supreme god was Zeus; Ouranos and Gaia, Okeanos, Chaos, etc., who for Professor Hack are 'the highest powers . . . which represent the divine universe,' were parents of the ruling powers, and there was no single deity immanent throughout the universe. Nor does the evidence warrant his speaking of water as 'the god of Thales,' 'the supreme god and the cosmogenetic god' (p. 42), or of the *ἄπειρον* of Anaximander as 'this Infinite and Indeterminate god,' 'his supreme god' (p. 43 f.).

The book opens with a discussion of Homer's gods and the meaning of the word *θεός*. With much that is wise and well expressed this portion contains some hard sayings. Because Homer sometimes attributes responsibility to an unnamed *θεός*, it is inferred that in such cases *θεός* did not refer to a personal being. But the natural explanation is merely that on such occasions one did not know which god was

responsible. Professor Hack's opinion is buttressed by such arguments as 'Perhaps the clearest proof of the tendency of *θεός* to be impersonal is the fact that the vocative was never used until a late period. On the other hand the Greeks could and did pray to the *θεοί* as a collective body of divine powers' (p. 8). But in polytheism, as opposed to monotheism, it is natural to address a single deity, whose attention is desired, by his own 'proper name' and, if it were not, lack of instances of the vocative singular is no proof that a word signifies something impersonal. One may also, perhaps, be forgiven incredulity when the anthropomorphism of Homer's gods is explained as a consequence of the honouring of Mycenaeans as heroes and the desire to affiliate them to greater powers. 'The anthropomorphism of these gods is essentially the price that Greek religion paid for hero-worship and the consequent attempt to relate certain gods to men' (p. 19, cf. p. 35). The systematic theology of Hesiod is on the whole fairly treated, but Mazon's suggestion that 'behind the myth of the mutilation of Ouranos, which puts an end to his disordered fertility, and the myth of the birth of Aphrodite, there lies the idea of the fixity of species; "perhaps the Platonic theory of Ideas is only a refined translation of the very simple sentiment that animated the unknown inventor of this myth"' is quoted with approval and the comment 'How great is the real difference between the thought of Hesiod and the thought of Homer?' (p. 24).

After a glance at the mystery religions the book proceeds to the 'pre-Socratic' views of the primary substance or, as Professor Hack urges, of 'the supreme god,' 'the supreme divine

power . . . now expressly identified with the cosmogenetic divine substance.' This matter of divinity apart, the discussion is fresh and illuminating. It will give even a Greekless reader a clear and on the whole sound understanding of these systems. Each is shown in relation to its background as a criticism of and attempt to improve upon earlier solutions of the problem. There are some points on which one may not accept Professor Hack's use of evidence; e.g., the Pythagorean views quoted by Diogenes Laertius (VIII. 24 ff.) from Alexander Polyhistor are obviously late and not, as is implied (p. 53), evidence for Pythagoras himself. It is an anachronism to speak of the brain as the organ of mind for Xenophanes (p. 64), and one may doubt whether for Heraclitus (B 45 Diels) 'the Psyche which has no limits is of

course the Mind and Soul of the universe' (p. 77). It is going too far to say, of Empedocles' doctrine, that 'Strife is a causal power that can fairly be identified with the Devil' (p. 102), and it is not true that with his Love and Strife alongside of Fire, Water, Earth and Air, 'for the first time in the history of Greek thought, two distinct classes of ultimate divine reality have been established. Love and Strife are just as real as the other four great gods but they are endowed with a specialized causal function' (p. 100). Already for Homer beside Hephaistos, Gaia, etc., there were Ares, Aphrodite, Eris, etc.

There is appended a bibliography, also an index of names and another of subjects, brief but adequate.

R. B. ONIANS.

University of Liverpool.

WHAT PLATO SAID.

What Plato Said. By PAUL SHOREY.

Pp. vii+686. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1933. Cloth, 27s. 6d.

THIS volume represents the ripe fruit of a long life devoted to the study of Plato, and, as such, it is of the greatest value. A particularly gratifying feature is that it contains hints that it is to be followed by further studies in which some of the more difficult points of interpretation are to be discussed in detail. These will be anxiously awaited by all students of Plato. The present volume is planned rather on the lines of Taylor's *Plato*. There is a long chapter on Plato's life, in which we are told a good deal about his predecessors and his contemporaries. It is in this chapter that the genuineness of the Letters is discussed. A much shorter one follows on Plato's writings. And the rest of the book is devoted to a summary of the contents of the writings, dialogue by dialogue, including at the end short accounts of the spurious dialogues. There is nothing beyond this; no discussion, for instance, of Aristotle's account of Plato's views, of the value of which, as we know,

Professor Shorey is more than doubtful. There are copious notes, mostly devoted to giving references and hardly any extending more than a few lines in length. These fill over 200 pages, and are concentrated at the end of the volume instead of appearing as footnotes, an arrangement which some readers may prefer and others will dislike.

The summaries of the dialogues are admirably done, with a sure judgement of the exact point at which a word of explanation or commentary is necessary. They are frequently enlivened by apposite and witty illustrations from modern writers and contemporary problems. One regrets in each case that the limits of space did not permit of their extension. It is impossible to comment on them in detail here. They are marked throughout by a robust commonsense which saves the writer from the pitfalls of far-fetched interpretation and unreal difficulties into which so many over-ingenuous commentators have fallen. On the other hand, it is possible that this virtue may occasionally be carried to excess and real difficulties and obscurities rather

too airily brushed aside. Professor Shorey seems at times reluctant to admit that there is anything difficult to understand in Plato's writings at all.

The same qualities appear in his treatment of more general problems. There is a refreshing insistence on the necessary limitations of our knowledge on many points on which some writers are ready to develop theories on little or no evidence. But sometimes the dismissal of rejected views may appear rather too brusque. Of the Letters the seventh and eighth are accepted as either by Plato or by an immediate successor, and therefore in general historically reliable. But all the others are dismissed out of hand as 'obviously spurious,' or 'too silly for serious consideration,' or 'impossible for Plato.' One may wonder whether Professor Shorey's perceptions are so immensely superior to those of Grote, Meyer, Burnet, Taylor and a host of minor scholars as to warrant quite such harsh dogmatism.

The general view that colours the interpretation throughout is the belief, familiar to readers of *The Unity of Plato's Thought*, that the leading ideas throughout all the dialogues are the same, and that in their main lines they were present 'more or less consciously' in Plato's mind from the beginning of his career as a writer. We are warned against exaggerations and misunderstandings of this view. It is not a revival of the view often (and wrongly, according to Professor Shorey) attributed to Schleiermacher that 'all the dialogues were composed as parts of a

preconceived program of philosophical teaching,' and it does not deny the possibility of some degree of development. But it insists, in precise opposition to Burnet, that 'Plato on the whole belongs to the type of thinkers whose philosophy is fixed in early maturity.' It is a necessary part of this point of view that all the dialogues equally represent Plato's own beliefs. The theory associated with the names of Burnet and Taylor receives short shrift from Professor Shorey. 'So gross a psychological improbability cannot be taken seriously. And in spite of the courtesy of British and the timidity of American reviewers it has not been taken seriously by many competent scholars.' Professor Shorey draws the conclusion that the Socrates even of the earliest dialogues is 'plainly a creation of Platonic philosophy and idealizing Platonic art.' And, as Xenophon is contemptuously dismissed as a possible witness, it follows that we can never know what the historical person, behind the idealized figure, was like. One need not be a follower of Burnet and Taylor to wonder whether the psychological improbabilities are all on one side here.

But the book as a whole is beyond question a great work. It is admirably written. And if occasionally it seems to adopt a little too much of the tone of 'I'm not arguing, I'm telling you,' who, after all, has a better right to adopt such a tone than the doyen of Platonic studies in the English-speaking world?

G. C. FIELD.

University of Bristol.

A NEW TEXT OF ARISTOTLE'S *DE MUNDO*.

Aristotelis qui fertur libellus De Mundo.

By W. L. LORIMER. Pp. 121. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1933. Paper, 50 francs.

MR. LORIMER has already added greatly to our knowledge of the text of the *De Mundo* by his publications 'The Text Tradition of Pseudo-Aristotle *De Mundo*' (1924) and 'Some Notes on the Text of Pseudo-Aristotle *De Mundo*' (1925). He has now put all students of ancient cosmogony and geography still

further in his debt by his splendid edition of the text. The work done on the text by previous scholars was very meagre. The Aldine text, which apparently rested on one MS only, was reprinted almost without change till the time of Bekker, who by using four MSS removed many mistakes in the vulgate text. The text was considerably improved by Wendland and Wilamowitz (in those parts of the work which were printed in the latter's *Griechisches*

Lesebuch), largely by the use of Stobaeus and the Armenian translation; but they seem to have used no MSS other than Bekker's, and no translation other than the Armenian. Mr. Lorimer has collated no less than 18 MSS, read through six others, and inspected in many passages 28 more, while he has verified the existence of 24 others and obtained information about many of their readings.

He discusses briefly but convincingly the relations of the MSS, which he divides into five families, flowing from three separate sources. His collation includes MSS from all these families, while Bekker's represented two only. He has discovered from Stobaeus and three ancient translations 89 readings of some importance unknown to the MS tradition, and has introduced 28 of these into his text, and in almost every case with complete justification. The alterations about which some doubt might be felt are those in 391b24,

392a10, 13, 394a22, 395a28, 397b33, 401a26, b7. He has been sparing in the introduction of emendations, either by himself or by others. Of the 19 he introduces, the only ones of whose rightness one might feel doubtful are those in 393b31, 394a11 (*ἀπὸ*), 396b28, 400b1, 3, 7. His own emendations in 392b16 (*ἐν γῇ*), 394a11 (*ἐστὶν ὅτε*), 395a13 (*<ὅς> βροντῇ*), 398a11 restore sense to difficult passages.

The apparatus is a model of precision. Containing in full, as it does, the readings of eleven MSS of the Aldine edition, of Stobaeus, and of five ancient or mediaeval translations, it is bound to be very long; but by the use of ingenious symbols Mr. Lorimer has conveyed a maximum of information in a minimum of space. The only thing that would have added to the value of this palmary edition is an index.

W. D. Ross.

Oriel College, Oxford.

GREECE AND THE AEGEAN.

Greece and the Aegean. By ERNEST A. GARDNER, Litt.D. With a Preface by Sir RENNELL RODD, G.C.B., and a chapter on Constantinople by S. CASSON, M.A. Pp. 254; 32 plates from photographs, coloured frontispiece, and 4 maps. London: Harrap, 1933. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

WITH Professor Ernest Gardner's *Greece and the Aegean* we feel at once that we are on safe ground. His life-long devotion to Greece and Greek Art is a guarantee that setting out, as he says, to write a book which will be of use to prepare those who are visiting Greece for what they are to see, he will neither disappoint nor mislead them. After a careful reading we willingly admit that the author has attained his object with considerable, if not perhaps with complete, success, for he furnishes the intending visitor with a well-planned and succinct account of what is to be seen, and sketches concisely and accurately the historical and cultural background. But it must be confessed that the standard set in the first chapter, entitled 'The Approach to Athens,' which suggestively recalls

the associations of each landmark seen by the visitor as he approaches by sea or land, is not long maintained. Partly because the author tries to impart a great deal of information in rather a limited space, and partly as a result of the detached, impersonal style of narrative, the succeeding chapters strike us as rather colourless and uninspiring. In fact, well though he knows the country, Professor Gardner's Greece seldom comes to life. It is to be hoped, however, that the reader will persevere to the end, for he will find proof, in Mr. Casson's account of Constantinople, that it is possible to serve up exact information in a really appetizing form, since his chapter is a model of its kind.

The traveller, on reaching Greece, will find that here and there the author's statements are not quite up to date, and he may be glad to avail himself of the knowledge that a new and largely rewritten edition of the *Guide bleu* for Greece was published in 1932 (Hachette), too late for Professor Gardner to notice. We observe, for instance, that the commencement of the systematic excavation

of the Athenian Agora, in 1931, is apparently not realized (pp. 29, 70); the terra-cotta Caryatid on the Erechtheum was replaced many years ago with a more harmonious cast in cement; the fountain in the Agora at Corinth is certainly not Glauke, which has been identified further to the west, beyond the Agora (p. 138); in the account of the National Museum we find no mention of the bronze Boy from Marathon, or the 'Hockey-players' bases, or the 'Leonidas' from Sparta. Moreover, the Dodona room has been for some years past emptied of its bronze objects and used for Attic votive-reliefs, and a selection of the finer vase-fragments from the Acropolis is well displayed in the same room as the white lekythoi. In regard to excavations, recent work at Delos by the French and at the Heraeum of Samos by the Germans deserves less cursory notice; and space might well have been found for mentioning some of the more interesting of recent discoveries, e.g. at Thasos, Olynthos, Lemnos, Perachora, Nemea, Asine and Kalydon. No harm, moreover, would have been done by stating that grave doubts exist as to whether the Hermes at Olympia is after all the original by Praxiteles. The general map at the end of the volume is too full of names to be easily read, and not free

from misprints. It is not obvious on what principle the 'Select Bibliography' was chosen, for after beginning impressively with Wheler and Spon, followed by Tournefort, its choices and omissions are alike curious. If Lear's *Albania* is cited for its coloured plates, why not Dodwell also? To supplement the author's own excellent book on Ancient Athens (1902) certain other works might have been mentioned, such as Harrison-Verrall, Weller, D'Ooge; and we find nothing on Greek Religion or the Theatre or the Drama. For the Greek islands in general space might have been found for Tozer, Bent or Manatt; and for individual sites Rhys Carpenter's short Guide to Corinth and that by Roussel to Delos are really necessities. In the selection of the illustrations, which are fairly representative, the same combination of old and new can be recognized. Alongside several admirable photographs by Boissonas and others there are at least half a dozen which betray their age too obviously by their subject or their damaged condition, that of Sparta and Taygetus (p. 167) being the worst offender. Over the architectural monstrosities on the dust-cover it is kinder not to linger.

A. M. WOODWARD.

University of Sheffield.

THE MERCATOR.

Plauti Mercator. Edidit P. J. ENK.
2 volumes. Pp. vi+98, 217. Leiden: Sijthoff, 1932. Paper, Fl. 3.75, 7.75.

AN early editor of the *Mercator* has recorded his opinion that the only value of so depraved a work was to turn the disgusted reader to virtue and the love of God. More recently it has been treated as the only play of its author which merits separate consideration. Avoiding these extreme and unbalanced views, let us welcome Dr. Enk's edition of this little-read yet admirable example—perhaps the wittiest extant—of the *vēa κωμῶδία*.

Enk's very reasonable introduction repeats the views he has expressed elsewhere—that this is an early work

of Plautus, that it is an unusually faithful copy of the Greek, and that the dream-scene formed part of Philemon's *Emporos* and is not (as Marx would have it) a Plautine insertion modelled on that in the *Rudens*. A further important point for the understanding of the play, which has hitherto been generally missed, is that Lysimachus, the so obliging and ill-requited *lepidus senex*, is himself interested in the fair Pasicompsa. The rest of Volume I is occupied by the text, which is in general that of Leo or Lindsay, and only departs from them on careful consideration, e.g. in l. 319. Volume II contains the very ample commentary of over two hundred pages, almost every line of the text being allotted a note. The matter

is excellent throughout, the citations are copious and the judgments expressed sound and independent.

The explanation of *dierectus* follows Lindsay. We do not quite understand the note on 198; it seems to suggest that the indicative of the indirect question is only found when the introductory word is in the imperative. Is *ut* after *mirum* (240) parallel to *ut* after *melius est*? Brevis Brevians (244) is, unfortunately, explained on principles of ictus, not of accent. Perhaps more might have been made of syntactical parallels in later authors; for example the use of *nisi* in 253 occurs in Cicero only twice—in a letter and in the *Pro Roscio Amerino*; the attention of the reader might well be invited to the peculiar position of this speech. The play on words in 284 is scarcely made clear. In 314 a new explanation is given of *decrepitus*; *crepare* is found in the sense of *dirumpi* (e.g. *Vulgata Act. Apost.: suspensus crepuit medius: et diffusa sunt omnia viscera eius*). Hence *decrepitus* = *plane diruptus*, 'broken down.'

Crusius' theory of 'responsion' (strophe, antistrophe, epode) is supported in the notes on 356-63, and again (in agreement with Sudhaus) at 830 ff. There is a certain amount of duplication, as in the notes on 198 and 386, and again on 390 and 455. Line 488, with its references to Achilles and Hector, is attributed to the original; Fränkel surely goes too far in so often crediting the Latin author with these mythological allusions. Enk agrees with Fränkel (as against Lindsay) that Brevis Brevians can operate over a change of speakers, and he supports Leo's theory of occasional monosyllabic *nobis*, *uobis*. Finally a detailed examination of Jacobsohn's theory ends in partial agreement; hiatus and *syllaba anceps* are possible after the sixth arsis of a trochaic septenarius or the fourth arsis of an iambic senarius, but not after the second arsis of a trochaic septenarius.

Altogether this is a worthy edition of a most entertaining play.

W. BEARE.

University of Bristol.

LUCILIUS AND VIRGIL.

ETTORE BOLISANI. *Lucilio e i suoi frammenti* (Prima versione italiana). Pp. 435. Padua: 'Il Messaggero,' 1932. Paper, L.30. *Quae Vergilius e Lucilio vel hauserit vel sumpserit*. Pp. 27. Padua: L. Penada, 1933. Paper.

As a large number of the fragments of Lucilius have no context and no meaning, it is not easy to see why anyone should want a complete translation. Mr. Bolisani has translated them all, but he has only been able to do so because Marx has fitted them all with contexts, and the 'gioventù studiosa' for whom he intends his version should be warned that his rendering of some of these scraps may bear no resemblance to what Lucilius said. Marx's creations, Titinius the glutton and Andronius the undertaker, are here again: when Marx has no ingenious fable to supply, Mr. Bolisani can find one in Cichorius, who for fr. 238 produces an unknown but well-connected contemporary of

Lucilius and endows him with a taste for oysters. But Marx never said that P. Licinius Crassus was consul in 108/9 B.C., and Cichorius did not suppose that the praetorship was a necessary preliminary to the aedileship. For these errors, which he seems to ascribe to others, Mr. Bolisani must take responsibility: to him also belong such mistakes as those of supposing that *cephalaea* is the name of a fish (50), that *cepharius* means a man who eats onions (195), that *signatam* means *violatam* (876). Since Mr. Bolisani proposes to follow this with a fuller critical edition, the apparatus criticus aims only at stating the source of emendations printed in the text; it does not always do that, for (e.g.) Junius' *vere* in 625, Mercier's *transfert* in 626, and Marx's *nomini* in 976 are not credited to their authors. Its value may be judged from the fact that Lachmann's *χρησιμ* in 731 and the *Pacideianum* with which Baehrens restored sense to 354 are not

mentioned at all. The short explanatory notes are based on Marx and Cichorius and show little discrimination. On 850 we read 'Catullo (XXVII. 3) ricorda una *bibosam quandam Postumiam*': the Latin words, of course, are not those of Catullus but those of Marx, and it would be interesting to know in what metre Mr. Bolisani imagines they were written. The introduction gives a sketch of the life of Lucilius and the characteristics of his work with references to authorities. Mr. Bolisani accepts Jerome's date for the poet's birth in spite of the difficulties involved: on p. 21 he attributes to Cichorius in 1907 a suggestion to explain Jerome which was already made by Munro in 1879. The bibliography prefixed is long but careless and far from complete: Lindsay's notes in *C.Q.* xx, Housman's in *C.Q.* i, Munro's in *J. Phil.* viii are omitted, and the reader who looks, as he is told, for an article by Walther in *Widensk. Sekr.* will look in vain: it is to be found in the more familiar *Wiener Studien*.

Servius on *Aen.* 10. 104 says 'totus hic locus de primo Lucilii translatus est': Marx threw doubt on this, suggesting that both Lucilius and Virgil were using Ennius, and Mr. Bolisani begins his article by a lengthy justification of Servius. He then goes on to find a series of other borrowings by Virgil. A few of these had been noted by Servius and Macrobius: most of the rest are trivial resemblances like the use of *macte virtute*, of *fultus* with an ablative, or of *numero* with a cardinal. Mr. Bolisani is not even consistent in his superfluous labour. In his commentary on fr. 18 (which he prints as *haec ubi dicta, dedit pausam ore loquendi*) he cites *Aen.* 1. 81 and 6. 76 and agrees that both poets may have borrowed from Ennius: here he scorns this opinion and tells us that Lucilius got his expression from Xenophon or Herodotus and that Virgil took it from him.

C. J. FORDYCE.

Jesus College, Oxford.

LATIN INSCRIPTIONS.

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Borussiae editum. Voluminis sexti (*Inscriptiones Urbis Romae Latinae*) partis quartae fasciculus postremus. *Additamentorum auctarium*, edidit MARTINUS BANG. Berolini apud W. de Gruyter et socios. MCMXXXIII. Imp. 4to. Pp. viii + 3755-4066. Paper. M. 96.

Inscriptiones Italiae: Academiae Italiae consociatae ediderunt. Roma: La Libreria dello Stato. Music 4to. Paper. Volumen XI: Regio XI. Fasciculus I: *Augusta Praetoria*; curavit PIERO BAROCELLI. Pp. xix + 68 + map and 3 plates. 1932. Lire 60. Fasciculus II: *Eporedia*; curavit IOSEPHUS CORRADI. Pp. xv + 33 + map. 1931. Lire 30.

THE constant discovery of new inscriptions in Rome long threatened to turn *CIL* VI into an endless serial. For fifty years scholars endured to use its growing wealth without any sort of

index, until in 1926 the *index nominum* came to show that the Prussian Academy had wisely set itself a limit and that the next fascicule would finish the collection of the texts. All inscriptions published before the end of 1915 were to find a place; but, with rare exceptions, later accessions were to be left for other treatment. So with the present part the documents are complete, and a work which has been in course of issue since 1876 now lacks nothing but the remaining indexes.

The preparation of the new fascicule, of which the earlier sheets went to press in 1913, was begun by Mr. Huelssen, and since 1909 has been in the hands of Mr. Bang. For them and their collaborators all praise would be impertinent and none too high. Though most of the material in this part is twenty years old or more, the labour which it enshrines is as valuable as—according to such tests as a first reading has allowed—it is accurate. The

apparatus of inscriptions already published has been meticulously revised; references to literature both old and new have been increased; and, save in a few early sheets printed before *ILS* III/2 was available, Dessau's numbers of such texts as appear in *ILS* have been added. Already, indeed, the first signs of age are to be discerned. It is small loss that 36840 (the Forum *cippus*) is untroubled by the discussions which have occurred since Lommatzsch wrote his commentary for *CIL* I³, but there are occasional causes for regret—for instance, that 37045 (*ILS* 8888) appears without mention of the remarks made by Cichorius in 1922. Shortcomings, however, such as these are an inevitable result of the delays which must beset so long and difficult a piece of printing.

About the usefulness of the work as a whole no reader will be in doubt. Much of its material may be familiar. Apart from the Forum *cippus* and the enfranchisements of Pompeius Strabo, there are many old friends—like L. Caninius Gallus and C. Fufius Geminus (36809), Appius Maximus (37049) on whom impartiality has given more emphasis than they deserve to the views of Pichlmayr and von Domaszewski, and Allia Potestas (37965). But there is still grist for many mills. Lexicographers, for example, may be commended to 37337 (*occurunt*), 37529 (*exacricata*), 38506 (so = *sum*), 38771a (*ensorum* = *mensium*), and 37303. In the last there are at length united the two parts (formerly known as 33393 and 33395) of the single stone which, with the help of a false reading by Gatti, led Leo (*Mélanges Boissier*, 357 f.) to add 'vestipica' to the vocabulary of Republican Latin and to introduce it into Plautus, *Trin.* 252. Now it is confirmed that H. L. Wilson was right in saying (*AJP* XXXI, 40) that in both places 'vestispica' is plain; and so, as Dessau rightly indicates, the whole of the supposed evidence for 'vestipica' finally disappears. Historians will read the volume through. They will find rich material in the texts, much of value in the comments (such as the editor's reasons for dating 37773—Julius Julianus, 'vir magnus, philosophus pri-

mus'—to the time of the death of Commodus), and very little to criticize. To Mr. Bang and his helpers scholars will remain lastingly in debt for a volume in all ways worthy of *CIL* and its best traditions.

The two fascicules of *Inscriptiones Italiae* are the first-fruits of an ambitious enterprise undertaken by the Italian Unione Accademica Nazionale. Neither of them boasts a preface, and in the absence of light from that source we are left to gather what we may about the nature of the project as a whole from a brief announcement which has appeared in certain continental journals. From this it is to be gathered that the intention is to collect all inscriptions relevant to Roman antiquity, whether in Latin or in Greek, found on territory now under Italian jurisdiction. The edition of so vast a mass of material with commentaries adequate to modern needs is a task which deserves all encouragement; and readers of the first instalments will pitch their hopes high. In particular, they will rejoice that the most serious defect of *CIL*—a defect imposed by the technical limitations which prevailed when its publication began—is here made good: all the more important texts are illustrated either by photography or by drawings in line-blocks, and so the epigraphic evidence for the dates of the documents becomes accessible.

Clearly we are at the beginning of a work destined to hold a foremost place in the apparatus of scholarship, and at such a time the responsible directors will doubtless welcome any reflections offered, not as criticism of what has been well done already, but in the hope that what remains may, if possible, be done better still. Here are a few. (i) It seems that, so far as Italy is concerned, one volume of the new publication is to be devoted to each of the eleven Augustan *regiones*. Both the present fascicules belong to Vol. XI; but each has a numeration of its own. If the inscriptions of every municipality are to be numbered separately, the work when complete will be gratuitously cumbrous to quote. (ii) The half-tone reproductions are a most laudable addition: but they should

never be offered, as in II, 21, as a substitute for transcriptions. No photograph can be good enough to make otiose the report of one who has seen the stone itself. And here the photographs are not all good: some, indeed—e.g. I, 22 and 47—are so poor as to prove the unwisdom of omitting marks of line-division from the transcriptions. The blocks printed on art-paper are satisfactory enough, except when the object is so small as to need photographic enlargement, as in I, 74, fig. 25; but those in the text itself suffer because they have been made with a screen too fine for the paper. (iii) Careful as are the concordances at the end, if references are given to Diehl, *ILCV*, there can be no doubt that Dessau, *ILS*, deserves the same attention. (iv) The maps should be mounted to fold out and should be inserted so that, when open, they face the text. Moreover, it would be well if more care were taken to see that they show the places mentioned in the introductions: the failure of II in this respect is due to a map drawn for Aosta having been made to serve for Ivrea as well. (v) Finally, a

greater general uniformity would add distinction. A strong and active editorial committee would have seen—to give a few examples—that Mommsen's *Staatsrecht* was regularly quoted either from the German or from the French translation, that Strabo was not represented—as in II, pp. xii and xiii—to have spelled the name of Eporedia in two different ways in a passage where it only once occurs, that *ILS* was not quoted as 'Dessau, *Syll.*' (II, p. 5), and that Mommsen was spared connection with a strange view about the enfranchisement after the Social War (II, p. xv—where for '*C.I.L.*, I, p. 118' it would have been better to write '*CIL* I², p. 481').

Such small defects as these may be avoided with ease in later parts. It is to be hoped that their removal will not be thought superfluous. *Inscriptiones Italiae* is a publication of promise so great that those responsible for it will not readily be content with a standard of performance lower than the high ideal attained by the majority of the volumes in *CIL*.

HUGH LAST.

St. John's College, Oxford.

THE LAST CENTURY OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC.

The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume IX. The Roman Republic 133-44 B.C. Pp. xxxi+1023; maps, tables, plans, etc. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 37s. 6d.

THIS massive book is no light reading. The co-operation of scholars, some of them noted experts, offers us detail so abundant that even a careful reader may at times find it hard to keep pace with writers who have themselves collected evidence and formed their own opinions gradually. Rome is of course the centre, and the long tragedy of corruption and bloodshed is a record of internal maladies. But the study of the symptoms leads us far afield. In short, expansion and misgovernment have created an Empire that can only be ruled successfully by an Emperor. Whether internally or externally, the period is necessarily one in which per-

sonal ambitions and qualities played a decisive part. For the ever-recurring problem was how to deal with the selfish clique of 'best men' who under the constitution monopolized office and power, who turned power to their own private profit, and who often obstructed action devised in the interest of the state. Hence we have the story of the Gracchi with which this volume begins, and of which the careers of Marius and Sulla, of Pompey and Caesar, are a continuation. And it is to be noticed in reading the story of these and the minor political figures that the stream of tendency is setting steadily in one direction. The cause of the *populares* may fail through the clumsy mishandling of a Marius or a Cinna; but the victory and adroit reaction of Sulla cannot kill it, and Sulla's system quickly fails and fails for good under

the pressure of a stronger reaction. In the case of Pompey and Caesar the story is essentially the same; Pompey is on the rise and rises high until he lends himself to the *optimates* as their champion. Then the clear-sighted Caesar, *popularis* in the Marian line of succession, proves that he understands his Rome and his Italy far better than do the nobles and dreamers whom the Gracchan movement followed by the Sullan settlement has left in the seat of power.

Now, though the final appreciation of Caesar is a fine effort of judgment, recognizing his many-sided and practical genius while explaining in what he failed, I wish for something more. I look for some equally emphatic statement of the situation in which he found himself at the end of 50 B.C., when he certainly had either to destroy or to be destroyed. It can be gleaned from the narrative bit by bit, but the point is worthy of stress. That I may be biassed in thinking the treatment of Pompey too favourable is not for me to deny. But the picture of his later years seems to me a pitiful scene, calling for a criticism as searching and severe as is applied to Caesar. Nor is it quite clear to me that the character and significance of Marius get their due. The Sullan tradition (even Sulla's own memoirs) surely played a great and malign part in fouling the great soldier's record; and, even with allowance made on that score, Marius has enough to answer for. But the memory of his services was dear to Romans while old Rome lived. That he was not a mere bloodthirsty ogre is indicated by the story of his sheltering Sulla in a riot (which Sulla denied) and by the verdict of Sulla on his skill in a matter of rural life [Plutarch *Marius* 35, Pliny *N.H.* XVIII 32]. There are other figures of the period, such as Catiline, whom other students might portray in somewhat different colours; for it is in the colouring, the turn of a phrase or the choice of an epithet, that a subtle difference betrays itself, not in lack of detail. And in that age of stress the motives and results of policies and crowded actions are over and over again determined by the character of this or that individual.

The structure of this volume is worth noting, and is clearly the outcome of careful consideration. So far as Rome is concerned, there are three groups of chapters each of which is wholly or mainly the work of a single hand. From Tiberius Gracchus to the breakdown of the Sullan system our conductor is Mr. Last. From the rise of Pompey to his return from the East Dr. Cary takes up the story. From the affair of Catiline to the death of Caesar most of the narrative is due to Prof. Adcock. But the history of the time leads us far afield. Africa, Asia Minor, the Euxine countries, Armenia, Parthia, all have to be dealt with sooner or later with the help of special experts, and this brings in Prof. Ormerod and Prof. Rostovtzeff, Dr. Bevan and Dr. Tarn. To combine all these elements was no easy matter, at least so as to build up an intelligible and instructive whole. The editors find their way out of the difficulty by contributing as Preface an admirable critical survey of the coming narrative and by providing, in Mr. Stevenson's Chapter X, a sober and searching analysis of the Roman empire, how it grew and how its merits and faults affected for good or evil the whole Mediterranean world. The chapters on Literature and Society in the age of Cicero by Mr. Sikes and Prof. Wight Duff are good and profitable reading. But I feel that the authors would have liked a little more room. Art treated by an expert like Mrs. Strong and Law by Prof. Zulueta bring this massive volume to a dignified close. I could have welcomed a paragraph or two devoted to agriculture, but there are of course scattered references to the subject in connexion with land legislation and in the passage (pp. 770-1) on Varro. That it is not wise to underrate the rural prosperity of Italy in the last period of the Republic is well asserted (p. 791), but perhaps too unreservedly; the state of things revealed in Cic. *pro Tullio* was probably not unique. Nor can I admit that the peasant emigrants to the Provinces were the same class as we mean (farm labourers) by such an expression. Nor does the reference to Rostovtzeff meet my objection.

No feature is more striking than the amount of details recorded. The chapters in which wars are described give particulars often so minute that even a studious reader must wish for a military equipment of local maps and plans. As in Volume VIII, the map-service here is not up to the standard of the text. The folding maps are disappointing; they do not supersede the ordinary atlas, and they are awkward to use. In the case of the 'Social' War the wretched state of our authorities perhaps forbids a better apparatus. In that of the great Civil War the campaign of Ilerda has a moderately good map, but in trying to follow Caesar's march from Dyrrhachium to Pharsalus I miss the help of one representing the physical features of the country traversed. This march was surely a wonderful feat, the supreme test of the army's efficiency and temper—even more so than its performances on the fields of battle. Again, maps specially designed to illustrate a book ought to give the position of every place named in the text. This rule is not always followed here, for instance in Map 13 (Gaul). And Map 7 is a striking instance of awkward position; for you have to use it with parts of the book hundreds of pages apart.

Another annoying practice is less serious, namely the constant references to Volume IV of Plates. When the said volume appears, these references will be most enlightening; at present they amount to 'wait and see.' On the other hand the longer notes on special topics, the copious bibliographies, the chronological and genealogical tables, etc., with general indices, occupy a space of some 100 pages of well-spent labour.

A reviewer in the *Times* (*Lit. Suppl.* 9 March, 1933) lately remarked 'History is not merely the expression of opinion any more than it is merely the art of telling a story. It is also an attempt to rediscover truths hitherto unappreciated.' A reasonable saying, and one that would apply to the present book, though actually used in speaking of a brilliant sketch by one gifted writer. The same attempt is made here, but in team-work form, successfully; the

measure of success can hardly be judged in a formula acceptable to all readers.

In more than 1,000 pages there must be many little slips or omissions. But the proof-reading has been marvellously good. And it is not always easy to say that a little bit of evidence should have been referred to. In the chapter on the Jews nothing is said of the passage in Cicero (*pro Flacco*, §§ 66-7) in which a rather troublesome Jewish element in Rome itself is recognized. On this passage comment from Dr. Bevan would have been welcome. But maybe it seemed irrelevant to the main thesis of that chapter, and only an orator's reference to suit his purpose of the moment. Of all the authorities cited in this great work perhaps there is none that more perpetually needs to be checked and revalued in relation to circumstances than the utterances of Cicero. On one topic of importance, the social and political state of the local towns of Italy, Cicero, himself *municipalis*, is our most lively witness. He it is that lays bare the corruption and baseness to be found in some of them. To them he appeals for support in public questions, to them he calls for patriotic efforts in the hour of trial. But his Gladstonian power of self-persuasion could not stand the test of facts, and in knowledge of the actual world of the borough towns Cicero was no match for Caesar.

It is impossible to avoid all reference to a very important detail on which the opinions of scholars differ widely, the table of Heraclea and the so-called *lex Iulia municipalis*. I have not yet been able to see the article by A. von Premerstein on which the conclusions of Dr. Cary (*J.R.S.* XIX. part 2) and, in sequence, of Prof. Adcock (pp. 698-701) are based. Therefore I cannot venture to discuss these conclusions. I am not satisfied yet that the questions arising out of the text are finally settled, and it is not well to offer hasty opinions on so difficult a problem. In a later volume of the *History* some writer will need to face it boldly.

With ponderous honesty this volume treats of trade, navigation, finance, and other subjects as the story requires. Indeed, this material background forms

a scene on which much of the action takes place. Directly or indirectly the course of events is always being affected by the greed, skill, and audacity of individuals. The careers of the so-called Triumvirs are an illustration—Pompey the solid-grasping investor (see Tyrrell and Purser, Vol. III, pp. xxiv-v), Crassus the daring speculator-millionaire, Caesar winning Gaulish gold in fines and indemnities. Of the three Caesar alone got value for his money, he alone refrained from outraging the Jews and robbing the temple treasures, and for this wise self-restraint he had his reward at Alexandria. But when all is said and done it is not the material side of things that decided the fate of the Republic except so far as bribery went. The two generations of Romans with whom we are concerned were reaping the fruits of Pydna. Their position was now imperial, and the empire's growth could not be stopped, however hostile to expansion the Roman Senate might be. The responsibility was great and it had to be faced in an atmosphere of moral change. The stable temper of such a man as Aemilius Paullus was not reproduced in his son Scipio Aemilianus. The Greek education of Cornelia's sons marks for us the vain attempt to apply idealist first-principles to complicated Roman problems. The failure of the Gracchi left politics more complicated and more corrupt than ever. In the reactions and counter-reactions we come upon partisans representing various schools of Greek thought or travesties thereof—Stoic, Epicurean, Academic, eclectic or diluted to suit various temperaments. The pages of this book record instances enough. The true story of the deaths of Scipio and Drusus, the truth about Catiline, we shall never recover. But it seems that public opinion was now well used to regard murder as an ap-

pliance of politics, and Epicurean Cassius was a more effective tyrannicide than Stoic Brutus. Cicero exulted over the deed, Atticus always accepted facts genially. In short it was a period in which the exercise of mercy by victors seldom relieved the monotony of bloodshed; and the end was not yet. In appraising the character and diagnosing the aims of Caesar it is surely wise to call him the greatest of the Romans and to deny that he took Alexander as his model (p. 739). But that his mental development owed nothing to Greek thought would be a perverse statement and is judiciously avoided. As to the motives of Caesar's clemency opinions will differ. At the present moment it seems to be the fashion to ignore the presence of constitutional amiability in his temperament. Yet stray references in ancient writers suggest to me another view. And Suetonius, who on the whole justifies his murder, records the good-tempered facility with which he met and disarmed the scurrilous attacks of Catullus. I submit that some eminent scholars form an imperfect notion of the ceaseless hostility to Caesar, and efforts to ruin him, on the part of the Roman nobles. That he was one of themselves only made their hatred more bitter, and his efficiency was a perpetual challenge. In the Civil War he ended a state of things that was past mending. But I see no reason to believe that his regret at being prevented from saving the lives of Cato and Pompey was insincere. That we cannot restore a mental and moral portrait of this hero is sadly true. Against the cheap painting of a great figure without due attention to the setting I venture to protest. Lucan IX 1035-1108 is a rhetorical echo of the idle talk of his senatorial contemporaries.

W. E. HEITLAND.

St. John's College, Cambridge.

THE CULTURE OF THE TIME OF CICERO.

WILHELM KROLL: *Die Kultur der ciceronischen Zeit. I. Politik und Wirtschaft.* Pp. vi+157. (Das Erbe der Alten, Heft XXII.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1933. Paper, M. 6.20 (bound, 7).

PROFESSOR KROLL'S work is the first part of a systematic study of Roman social life during the Ciceronian period. It is based upon, but does not simply repeat, previous investigations by the author. The subjects reserved for the

second volume are the relations of the period to religion, women, slaves, Greek culture and art, with a chapter on society - manners. The present volume contains, in addition to a brief introduction, four chapters dealing respectively with the Roman conception of the state, the power of tradition, the individual in politics, and the private management of financial affairs. The notes (pp. 121-157) afford a full documentation indicating the author's sources, ancient and modern. Much in the text is inevitably familiar to any close student of Cicero's letters; but the material is very skilfully employed and marshalled. It is an admirable and thoroughly scientific trait that ideas, habits and movements are frequently traced to their beginnings in generations antecedent to the times of Cicero.

Among the subjects handled in the opening chapter may be mentioned the growth, partly under Stoic influences, of a sense of the duty to serve the state; the love of both country and city; the belief in Rome's exalted destiny in the world; the disdain for barbarians; and the conscious dignity of the senator, with some of the virtues which supported and faults which dishonoured it. Like other nations, the Romans laid themselves open to criticism in their treatment of alien races: there was, as the author points out, a certain appearance of 'cant' in their homage to *libertas*.

The second chapter is a lucid examination of the highly important part played in republican life by family

tradition—a factor which must be grasped in its ramifications (and they were many), if the history of the times, whether domestic or political, is to be understood. In the next chapter (the longest in the book) we meet one of the striking tendencies of the day running often wildly counter to any *mos maiorum*—namely, the action of the individual in public affairs. This is a feature which I have had occasion to emphasize in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, Volume IX. Though 'well-born' and 'well-connected,' the individual might scheme for his own hand regardless of either family or state, so that at no Roman epoch is such a divergence of personality discoverable. A brief appendix to this chapter treats gossip and correspondence. Then the final chapter treats the capitalism of Rome; the sources of wealth, as well as its use and abuse; investments, interest, debts and financial crises. It is serviceable to have arrayed here the main outlays which made the maintenance of one or more houses, or the pursuit of an official career, so costly in ancient Rome.

A few slips have been overlooked. P. 47, l. 27, 'conected' should be 'connected'; p. 59, l. 34, 'hahe' should be 'habe'; p. 119, l. 29, 'Cāsas' should be 'Cāsars'; and the Virgilian quotation, p. 122, n. 18, should run 'hae (not 'haec') tibi erunt artes.'

The second part of this valuable work will be very welcome.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

TWO SPEECHES OF CICERO.

M. Tulli Ciceronis pro M. Caelio oratio.
Edited by ROLAND G. AUSTIN. Pp. xix + 131. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

M. T. Ciceronis pro Q. Ligario oratio apud C. Caesarem. Introduzione e commento di ANTONIO GIUSTI. Pp. xxiv + 50. Milan: Società Dante Alighieri, 1933. Paper, L. 3.

AN English edition of the *Pro Caelio* was much needed; and here it is, well and thoroughly done. The text and

critical notes are from the plates of the Oxford Classical Text. There is a clear and satisfactory introduction, with a note on the MSS. and a bibliography; 68 pages of detailed commentary; 8 appendices; and 4 indices (nominum, verborum, rerum, locorum), the last of which is the most complete and useful. The commentary is very full and good; especially in the sphere of 'history and antiquities,' but there are many valuable linguistic notes as well. The style

of some of the English renderings is displeasing: e.g. § 8 ea in alterum ne dicas quae, cum tibi falso responsa sint, erubescas 'remarks . . . such as would make you blush when baselessly retorted on you,' and the version of § 25 qui in reliqua vita . . . disseruit. This latter passage raises a question important for the interpretation of the part of the speech that is a reply to that of Herennius. The editor says of the speech of Herennius (p. 65), 'The sentence dixit enim multa . . . disseruit shows that it fell into two parts, a general sermon on the vices of the age . . . and a scolding personal attack on Caelius:' and many of his subsequent comments assume the truth of this statement and depend upon it. But how, then, can the words obiurgavit M. Caelium sicut neminem unquam parens be accounted for? Without them, the whole sentence Dixit enim . . . disseruit would indeed suggest admirably the general sermon as opposed to the personal attack; but the words are there, and if they show anything they show that Herennius did not clearly separate the two lines of argument, but was delivering a personal attack on Caelius throughout. Hence the prima pars (§ 26) of his speech need not be regarded as 'introductory remarks,' and the deliciarum obiurgatio longa, etiam lenior (§ 27) can be more simply understood as the altera pars of the personal attack. A few more criticisms of detail may be allowed in dealing with a work that maintains so high a level of excellence. (1) The note on § 4 est . . . existimatio is unconvincing as it stands. (2) § 6 ab his fontibus . . . meorum: the English rendering is clumsy; the comparative latius is relative, not absolute; Cicero means that his public reputation is higher than it would have been without the approval and notice of his friends. (3) § 8 primum ut . . . seiungas: the two ut-clauses may surely be regarded as parallel clauses, the second expressing the sense of the first more clearly, and both depending on admonitum. (Verr. IV. 100 has been misunderstood and does not illustrate the alleged construction here.) (4) § 30 perfrugiis

nihil utor aetatis: 'I employ none of the refuges of youth' suggests a quite wrong sense—rather 'I am not taking refuge in the plea of his youth'; and the editor's comment here rather naïvely overlooks the common oratorical device by which you declare that you won't do what you have done and are doing. (5) § 36 habes hortos ad Tiberim is possible colloquial Latin for 'you have a garden by the Tiber'; take it so, and the rest of the sentence follows naturally enough; allegations of awkwardness in Cicero need very careful scrutiny. (6) § 77 bonorum virorum is surely intolerable following the descriptive genitives bonarum artium bonarum partium: the proposed emendations must be considered seriously. (7) § 79 'the hexameter rhythm of exstingui volnere vestro is remarkable': surely not? the run of the sentence separates exstingui from volnere vestro; and patches of such rhythm in the middle of sentences are common enough—§ 76 iste interpositus sermo, § 77 si cui nimium effervisse videtur, § 78 qui Catuli monumentum adfixit are examples close at hand.

The *Pro Ligario*, a short, attractive, interesting speech, deserves an English school edition. Its editor will find Fr. Richter's school edition (Leipzig, 1870) a better guide than the present volume—more concise, scholarly and sensible. Giusti's well-written introduction shows better judgment than his commentary; much of this seems useless except for beginners, and yet we find such notes as this: '*Aliter* è forse un nominativo irrigidito da **aliteros* con sincope dell' *o*; in significato avverbiale era già trasformato nell' espressione plautina (Truc. 172) *longe aliter est amicus atque amator*=un amico è tutt' altra cosa che un amante.' Other comments show a curious lack of discernment, e.g. that on the famous *homines enim ad deos nulla re propius accedunt quam salutem hominibus dando*: 'Altrove (*de republ.* I. 7) Cicerone afferma invece che l' uomo non si avvicina mai tanto alla divinità come quando fonda città o guida felicemente quelle già stabilite.' 'Invece'? Many Latin words are misprinted. No index.

L. H. G. GREENWOOD.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

THE IMPORTANCE OF WORD ORDER IN VERGIL.

SOPHIE RAMONDT: *Illustratieve Woord-schikking bij Vergilius*. With a summary in English. Pp. viii + 231. Wageningen: Veenman. Paper, fl. 4.75.

THIS essay is just what a thesis ought to be. It is based on a sound principle, namely the added meaning which a poet expresses by the order of his words. To demonstrate this universally for Vergil would involve discussing at least every other line. Dr. Sophie Ramondt has wisely chosen one type of order and traced it out with a clearness and modesty of reasoning which make one feel that the study of Vergil has been enriched.

This type is the juxtaposition of an adjective or participle with another, agreeing with a different word. Thus in A. ix. 119 *demersis aequora rostris ima petunt*, the order explains *demersis* as meaning *demersis in aequora*. So in A. xii. 68 *mixta rubent ubi lilia multa alba rosa*, *mixta* explains *rubent* ('seem to glow red from being mixed'); and *alba* not merely defines the lilies, but in its position shows that the whiteness of the lilies needed an abundance of roses to overcome it. The mass of examples is classified according to the nature of the relation implied:

- (a) Mere contrast, or close similarity.
- (b) A limitation of meaning forced upon one of the epithets by the other; in *glauca canentia fronde* (G. 2. 13) although the willows look hoary the leaves have also a green side.
- (c) Perhaps the commonest case is that in which one explains the other, e.g. A. v. 125, *tumidis submersum tunditur olim fluctibus*; '*tumidis fluctibus*,

syntactically belonging to *submersum* as well as to *tunditur*, are distributed; the submerging is caused by the high tide, the waves are beating' (p. 195).

The limits set for this notice forbid me to mention some other interesting and more subtle effects. There is a good index of the passages discussed (nearly 1,000 in Vergil).

These remarks are based on the summary, written in excellent English. The complete discussion of the passages chosen is in Dutch.

Here and there there is an overstatement, as that there is 'no pause at the end of a line in recitation' (p. 191), or that the branches of the *amaracus* in A. i. 694 were 'all flowers'; and one hesitates over one or two translations, though never, I think, about the general interpretation of a passage; in E. 4. 20, *ridenti* must mean something as applied to *acantho* ('gleaming,' of the glossy leaf) besides its bearing on *mixta*; what indeed is a 'smiling mixture'? And one must demur to the old term *enallage*, which contains precisely the falsehood from which Miss Ramondt's thoughtful essay is meant to set us free. It is fatal to suggest that a word has no meaning in its own syntactical place, however much light it may throw on a neighbouring word which stands next to it. There is nothing in Vergil as forced as the *roseae niueo uertice uittae* of Catullus.

This would be a dangerous book for young schoolboys; but their teachers could hardly have more nourishing or attractive food.

R. S. CONWAY.

St. Albans.

CLARK'S ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

The Acts of the Apostles. A critical edition with Introduction and Notes on selected passages. By A. C. CLARK. Pp. lxiv + 427. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933. Cloth, 30s. In order to appreciate the interest and importance of this edition of the Acts it is necessary to glance at the views of some of the chief textual critics who in

recent years have studied the relations of the two types of text in which the New Testament is known to have been current in the early centuries. Fifty years ago Westcott and Hort wrote as follows: 'When the Western readings are confronted with their ancient rivals in order to obtain a broad comparative view of the two texts, few scholars

could long hesitate to pronounce the Western not merely to be the less pure text, but also to owe its differences in a great measure to a perilous confusion between transcription and reproduction.' Although many critics have come to hold that WH followed the great Uncials too closely, the generalization which I have quoted would still command very general assent. But there have been dissentients. Friedrich Blass, to whose memory Professor Clark dedicates his book, was so far impressed by many of the 'Western' readings in the Lucan writings that he accepted the authenticity of the 'Western' text. But since he also felt it impossible to ascribe the rival text to textual corruption, he embraced the theory that Luke himself put out two independent editions of his work. Clark shares the general opinion that it is impossible to assign both recensions to the same hand, but whereas J. H. Ropes in the last great critical edition of the text of Acts (*Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. III.) maintains a position in general agreement with WH, Clark argues for the opposite theory: the 'Western' text—or, as he prefers to call it, the Z text—is the original, and the text of the great Uncials (Γ text) is an abbreviation and a corruption. If this view were to win acceptance, it would spell revolution.

Clark's wide experience in the study of MSS has led him to the conclusion that of all forms of corruption of text, none is more common than omission, and it is his opinion that N.T. textual critics have in general paid too great deference to the maxim *brevior lectio potior*. *Prima facie* the greater length of the Z text is in favour of its originality, and he maintains that in many cases the longer reading can be shown to be intrinsically more probable. A second leading doctrine in this edition is based upon the observation that the beginning and end of the additional matter found in the Z text frequently coincide with the beginning and end of the sense-lines which are used in Codex Bezae for the Acts. It is generally agreed that this arrangement is older than Codex Bezae, and Clark gives reasons for supposing that it may well go back to

a remote antiquity. His theory is that the Γ text was formed by deliberate abbreviation and that the abbreviator tended to strike out *στίχοι*. The question, however, suggests itself how closely these two doctrines are bound up together. If the arrangement by sense-lines was primitive it would be as natural for an interpolator to adapt his new material to the existing form as it would be for an abbreviator to strike out material as far as possible in accordance with sense-lines. The vital question remains whether the Γ text as a whole can be explained as an abbreviation. Clark relies chiefly on certain passages where he thinks he can show that the Γ text has been 'botched' to cover the omission of material found in Z. I do not understand why he should consider them 'decisive.' One of the passages he adduces is ii. 30:

κατα σαρκα αναστησai τον χρν
και καθισai επι τον θρονον αυτου

where *στ. 1* and *και* are attested for Z, but are absent in Γ. His explanation is that Γ, having dropped *στ. 1*, has 'botched' *στ. 2* by dropping *και*. This is reasonable if we assume that omission by Γ is the cause of the discrepancy, but the presence of *και* may be accounted for with equal ease as 'botching' by an interpolator. We must still face the question whether omission by Γ is a probable explanation of the broad differences between the two texts, and it seems to me to be the real weakness of Clark's case that although he refers to Ropes' weighty statement of characteristics common to many of the additional clauses, he nowhere comes to grips with the argument which Ropes and others have based upon them. With the help of the heavy type in Clark's admirable edition of the Z text I have counted some fifteen cases in which Z gives to Jesus an additional title, *Χριστός* or *ὁ Κύριος*, which is not found in Γ. Again it is a commonplace of criticism that Z contains frequent references to the guidance of the Holy Spirit where there is nothing in Γ to correspond. Is it more likely that a Christian scribe deliberately excised these pious phrases, or that an editor inserted them? Clark

seems not to face this question. Indeed he says—surely by an oversight—that a main interest of Γ is edification.

Again I do not often find Clark's vindication of Z on grounds of historical probability convincing. I will take one case on which he lays great stress. In Acts xxiv. 7 ff. Γ makes Tertullus suggest that Felix should examine Paul in order to confirm the charges brought against him, whereas Z makes Tertullus refer Felix to the corroborative evidence of Lysias. Clark says that Γ makes 'nonsense.' But if Pilate can say of Another *ἐγὼ ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ἀνακρίνας οὐθὲν εὑρον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ αἴτιον ὧν κατηγορεῖτε κατ' αὐτοῦ* (Luke xxiii. 14), why is it 'nonsense' when Tertullus suggests that Felix should follow the same procedure?

In my judgment, therefore, Clark does not weaken the general considerations which have produced something like a consensus among textual critics that the text of the great Uncials is in the main the true text. Obviously, however, this general conviction is compatible with the admission that in any given case Z may preserve the original reading. One instance in which Clark has brilliantly vindicated the reading of Codex Bezae must be mentioned. In Acts xx. 4 all the Greek MSS except D make Gaius an inhabitant of Derbe. This is awkward since according to xix. 29 Gaius was a Macedonian. But instead of *Δερβαιοῦ* D reads *Δουβίριος* (d Doverius, g Doberius). Clark points

out for the first time in this connexion that the Doberes were a Macedonian people and that there was a town Doberos on the road from Philippi to Amphipolis. Thus there seems to be a strong case for supposing that the original text survives in D.

The portions of Clark's work which I suspect will prove most valuable in the long run are his learned and detailed Essays on 'The Witnesses to Z Text.' Here he breaks fresh ground. In the Essay on the Philoxenian Syriac he subjects Ropes' theory that the *marginalia* of Thomas of Harkel reproduce readings of the Philoxenian Version to a searching examination and, so far as I can judge, establishes his case that the *marginalia* give the readings of the Greek MS which Thomas read at the Enaton monastery. In the Essay on Codex Bezae he argues that the scribe is so uncertain both in Greek and in Latin that it is well to look for a trilingual country as the place of origin. Various indications suggest Egypt, so that, if this is right, the home of D was the home of the Michigan Papyrus and of the Codex which Thomas read at the Enaton. For these and other researches and speculations Professor Clark has earned the gratitude of N.T. students; and whether or no his views win converts, Z itself will remain an important monument of the history of the early Church. In no other edition can it be so well studied as in this.

J. M. CREED.

St. John's College, Cambridge.

RUTILIUS NAMATIANUS.

Rutilius Claudius Namatianus de reditu suo. Herausgegeben und erklärt von RUDOLF HELM. Pp. vi+59. Heidelberg: Winter, 1933. Paper, RM. 1.80.

It is now twenty-one years since the last edition of Rutilius appeared, and Herr Helm deserves well of his countrymen for re-editing the poet in the light of such fresh views as have been propounded since 1912. His edition consists of a short introduction, a text with a full apparatus criticus, and short exegetical notes. All this in some sixty

pages means an economy of words which will leave his readers demanding in some cases more, in others what he means. An introduction of no more than two pages, for example, necessitates dogmatic statements on matters under dispute. We are told categorically that the poet's appellation was Rutilius Claudius Namatianus, though the form Namatianus is uncertain and the order of the three names still more so. We are informed that he wrote his poem contemporaneously with his journey, though it is a tenable view

that it was written eight years after; and the date of composition is given as 417 with no more explanation for this departure from the usually accepted 416 than a reference to an article in the *Philologische Wochenschrift*.

In textual matters Herr H. is conservative to a degree. Attractive emendations sing to a wax-filled ear, and Baehrens' *par* (for MSS. *bona*) *parcendique* (I. 71), Schenkl's rearrangement of I. 101-110 and Damm's of I. 228-235 (H. attributes this wrongly to Schenkl), Müller's *lota* (I. 104), Castalio's *specimen* (I. 544: H. keeps the MSS. *speciem*, citing three passages none of which support the reading), Reid's *Iliacae* . . . *deteriore* (II. 48) and many others are relegated, where they find mention at all, to the app. crit. In some cases his conservatism leads him to keep readings which will not, or will scarcely, translate: e.g. I. 112 *quae* . . . *ludat*, I. 206 *fideret*, I. 248 *sono* (not even mentioning V's *marginale*, *sinu*), I. 522 *latebram* . . . *agit*. In this last instance *latebram agere* is supposed to mean *latere*, and for this strange use Herr H. cites three passages in the *Thes. L. L.*, where the curious will be disappointed to find no mention of *agere* with *latebram* but only with such old friends as *fugam*, *silentia* and *otia*. Herr H. offers a few emendations of his own (if the modest 'Helm' be he), among which may be mentioned the possible *veneror* of I. 421 and the unlikely *intersecat* of I. 539 (certainly no improvement on Castalio's *interligat*). Many difficulties are left unexplained: e.g. I. 216, I. 259 (an editor who keeps *arma* [= *cornua*] *iuuenci* should surely

gloss it), I. 373 (*pagi*), II. 42 (*arcami*); others are insufficiently dealt with: e.g. I. 551 (no note on *patriis* to say that Protadius came from Trèves), 595 (no note on the odd form *Lachanius*). In some cases a wrong, or at least a questionable, explanation is given: e.g. I. 247 *natatibus* not *Schwimmbad* but abstract 'swimmings'), I. 275 (*sedem*—if kept—not *Grundlage* but *dwelling place*), I. 312 *Lepidum* (= *-orum*) should probably be taken with *ense*, not with *malum*). Not infrequently Herr H. shifts his exegetical responsibilities by referring to standard works; but it is difficult to see who gains from bare references à propos of the *Lepidi* (I. 295 et sqq.) to Pauly-Wissowa, of the plural *Cincinnati* (I. 556) to Löfstedt's *Syntactica*, of the satirist *Turnus* (I. 604) to Schanz, or of the ambiguous *repor-tando* (I. 630) to Kühner.

Room for necessary explanatory matter might easily have been made had Herr H. restricted the amount of his often interesting, but oftener superfluous, parallel passages. He uses an exclamation mark (most alarmingly to those who have missed his unobtrusive note on p. vi '!= an gleicher Versstelle') with good effect. But notes like (I. 626) 'terribilisque (!) Ov. tr. 1. 2. 15' (and such occur on every page) prompt one to think the exclamation mark a justifiable comment on the annotator's methods.

Still, this edition has the merits of its defects. It is succinct and handy and, for such as like their information in tabloid form, meaty enough.

M. PLATNAUER.

Brasenose College, Oxford.

THE CAMPAIGNS OF JUSTINIAN.

G. P. BAKER: *Justinian*. Pp. xvii + 340; illustrations, maps, and diagrams. London: Nash and Grayson, 1932. Cloth, 18s.

'THE deeds of Belisarius, as recounted by Procopius, make one of those great books of adventure the list of which begins with the *Iliad* and ends, for the present, with the epic of the Arabian desert.' This biography is based upon the *Secret History* and the *Wars of Pro-*

copius; it is primarily a military narrative, and it is in this rapidly moving narrative that Mr. Baker is at his best. With theology he is not concerned: he can write 'in notifying the pope of his election the emperor is made to attribute it . . . to the favour of the Indivisible Trinity—a phrase sufficient to class him as catholic and orthodox.' Apparently Mr. Baker regards Monophysitism as a form of Unitarianism.

No use is made of the *De Aedificiis* of Procopius, and of the architectural significance of Sancta Sophia there is not a word. On Justinian's work in the codification of Roman Law there are a few rhetorical sentences: 'it was a greater work in some ways than that of Plato or Aristotle,' but precisely in what that work consisted the reader is not told, while the emperor's agent in the task of codification is curiously always styled *Tribunian*. Of the emperor's novels nothing is said. On imperial administration and administrative reform it is difficult to be breezy, and these subjects are therefore omitted from Mr. Baker's treatment. It is as an account of the campaigns that this book will be read. Unfortunately it is not easy to read it with any patience. Those who like history to be presented to them in the idiom of the gangster and 'the bright young thing' may perhaps enjoy it, but to others Mr. Baker's style will appear at once vulgar and wearisome. The character sketches are hardly illuminating: Theodora liked

'Justinian's reliability, his gift for finality. He was a man who did not take his money back or argue over change; and he kept his appointments. . . . When he was a boy he must have stayed where his mother put him, for he still preserved the same trait. It is one that most women find rather endearing.' But the trouble with Justinian surely was that he would never 'stay put.' Do we really know more of John of Cappadocia by being told that 'had he lived to-day he would no doubt have done his round of golf and driven a high-powered car with any of his contemporaries; with a dictaphone and a good stenographer he would not have needed to worry about those nasty things, pen and ink: and no one would ever have thought of alluding to his difficulties with these articles'?

Mr. Baker has not allowed himself the time to comprehend the variety and the complexity of the problems with which Justinian wrestled.

NORMAN H. BAYNES.

University College, London.

BYZANTINE CIVILISATION.

STEVEN RUNCIMAN: *Byzantine Civilisation*. Pp. 320. London: Arnold, 1933. Cloth, 16s.

A REVIEWER of this book is forcibly reminded of the verse in *Canticles*, 'Take us . . . the little foxes that spoil the vines: for our vines have tender grapes.' This is a vine rooted in much reading, knowledge and enthusiasm, and its grapes are charm and stimulation to thought. But the numerous little foxes of inaccuracy are as irritating as they are surprising in the production of such a scholar and such a publisher. For instance, we find 'Aphthartocathartic' for 'Aphthartodocetic' (37. 29), 'Noutheticos' for 'Noutheteticos' (81. n. 2, 83. n. 1), 'eidekon' for 'eidikon' (91. 25), *κλεισούραι* transliterated on p. 93 once as *Clissurae*, once as *Cleisurae*, 'Leo IV' where 'Leo VI' is meant (123. 11), 'Eastern coast of Asia Minor' instead of 'Western' (150. 16), the sack of Thessalonica dated rightly as 904 on pp. 151 and 247, and wrongly as 908 on p. 205, 'Bois-

sonade' for 'Boissonnade,' a totally distinct writer (201. n. 2), 'Via Ignatia' for 'Egnatia' (211. 8), 'Holospyrism' for 'Holosphyrism' (235. 4), 'fourth century' as the date of Anaximander, actually born in 610 (235. 31), 'Oribasius' for 'Oribasius' (237. 31), 'steatite' for 'steatite' (257. 26 and 264. 32), and the Cabinet des Médailles of the Bibliothèque Nationale placed in the Louvre (265. n. 1). These and others are flaws which a second edition may remedy. But graver objections may be brought against several of the statements made. Thus it is surely an exaggeration to say that the Bogomils 'preached disobedience to the State' (114. 18 and 118. 18), and an unfounded assumption that the curriculum of Church schools after 1261 was 'no doubt limited to theology' (230. 14). The summary rating of the Seljuks as 'barbarous and destructive' (293. 18) will make many art-critics indignant, and the often repeated assertion that the Byzantines thought life on earth 'a mockery,' or 'drab and ugly,'

or 'a foolish travesty,' is decidedly open to question. One curious thing is that whereas the paragraph on Theology on p. 234 is very inadequate, not to say flippant, the Byzantine Church receives most fair and sympathetic treatment on pp. 129-35. The best chapters are the 'Historical Outline' at the beginning,

and 'Byzantium and the Neighbouring World' at the end. But indeed the whole book, in spite of mistakes and certain obscurities and tricks of style (notably slang), has throughout the supreme merit of readableness. Like Bottom's imagined audience, we say: 'Let him roar again.'

GEORGINA BUCKLER.

GENERATIONS.

ENGELBERT DRERUP: *Das Generationsproblem in der griechischen und griechisch-römischen Kultur*. (Stud. z. Gesch. u. Kultur d. Altertums. XVIII. 1.) Pp. 160, 8vo. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1933. Paper.

THIS is the first of three projected volumes of *Kulturprobleme der klassischen Griechentums* and is to be followed by essays on 'Periods of Classical Philology,' on 'Education in Greek Antiquity,' and on Homeric subjects. Even in this instalment the author ranges widely over Greek history and literature, and digresses into art-criticism to illustrate his thesis.

When we speak of the 'Homeric,' or the 'Periclean,' or the 'Augustan Age,' what precisely do we mean? Is all history made up of such periods approximately of the length of a generation? And if so why? *Οἷον περ φύλλων γενεή, τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν*. But is the tree of humanity deciduous or evergreen, or is it like the Tree of Life which 'yieldeth its fruit every month'? Chronologers in old Greece reckoned in generations of various lengths, and Rümelin calculated in 1875 the length of such a period of effective replacement of a population, for modern European countries. But is it possible (and if so, useful) to delimit such replacement, like a work of art, with 'a beginning, a middle, and an end'? Ranke in 1874 thought that it was, and that a 'generation' was a way of expressing the operation of 'certain ideas in the lifetime' of those who compose it; Kummer in 1909 and Hans von Müller in 1917 and 1928 attempted such a classification for German literature, the latter with an eye to library arrangements. But the 'generation-theory' with its $3 \times 3 \times 3$ 'generations'

forming a 'world period' of 900 years originated with Lorenz in 1866; though Scherer in 1883 found a period of 600 years more suitable for German literature; and the younger Lorenz in 1928 elucidated western music by alternate periods of 600 and 300 years.

Unfortunately western music and even German literature hardly give these constructions a chance as yet. Professor Drerup has accordingly attempted an examination, on similar lines, of the longer span of Greek history. Here too he has predecessors, notably Wolf Aly's *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur* (1925). But there are difficulties; that the concept of a 'generation' is really not 'genealogical,' but depends on the relation between a people and its leaders (*Schöpfer*), including those *Mäcene* who by their patronage make leadership possible; that the supersession of one such phase by another does not occur punctually, any more than it has anything directly to do with birthdays, but depends on a 'something' which this essay is an attempt to elucidate by Greek examples.

But have we, even in the material arts—where excavation puts thousands of specimens at our disposal—adequate data for such interpretations (p. 19)? Of how many leading Greeks do we know the precise age, or even the age at which they made their début, and started (if they *did* start) a fresh 'generation'? Are the statesmen, or the writers, or the potters, to be regarded as the pioneers of the new outlook and phase of activity? And is it, after all, the originality of the 'leaders' or the receptivity and response of the 'mass' of contemporaries, that is the vital factor; or is there after all a

chapter of accidents, *momentumque fuit mutatus Curio rerum?* What are the odds that Xerxes' invasion occurred just at the crucial point in the sequence of Attic 'generations'?

Professor Drerup applies his method first to 'political' generations, then to the history of Attic drama, classical and Graeco-Roman prose literature, Roman poetry, and representative art.

An appendix on the 'classical beauty' of Greek poetry raises an interesting question, quite irrelevant here, and does not contribute much to an answer. And the composition schemes both of Homer and of Herodotus are far more intricate than Professor Drerup imagines.

J. L. MYRES.

New College, Oxford.

BEOWULF AND THE AENEID.

A Comparative Study of the Beowulf and the Aeneid. By TOM BURNS HABER. Pp. x+145. Princeton University Press (London: Milford), 1931. Cloth, 18s.

MR. HABER hopes 'that he may establish the strong probability that there is in the *Beowulf* evidence that the author did possess an acquaintance with the *Aeneid* and took from it various plot-motifs, stylistic devices and turns of expression which appear in the Anglo-Saxon epic.' The general thought is not new, having occurred to Zappert, Brandl, Lawrence, Ker, Chambers and others. One who wrote, as the author of *Beowulf* appears to have done, in the first half of the eighth century might well have read Virgil if he belonged to the small circle of scholars like Aldhelm and Alcuin. Mr. Haber would pass from this possibility to his probability by way of internal evidence. Among 'indications of non-Germanic influence' he urges that in 'plot technique' *Beowulf* differs from the other Old English epics, but these he assumes to be adequately represented by the surviving Christian epics (*Juliana, Elene, Andreas, Christ*), and even so their different use of episodes, digressions, etc., is no proof of any connection between *Beowulf* and the *Aeneid*, any more than the fact that *Beowulf* is not a 'ballad,' an authentic history, or built exactly like a Norse saga. That the poem speaks occasionally of gold ornamentation is for Mr. Haber a further 'indication of non-Germanic influence,' yet he knows that this feature can be explained by the Scandinavian setting of the poem itself or the idealizing imagination of the poet, if not by the actual splendour of

Anglian courts. That *Beowulf's* thegns do not stand by him in his fight with the dragon as the followers of a Teutonic king were expected to is 'a very outstanding case of anti-traditional plot-motivation.' Teutons in those days, apparently, always did as they ought, and, if they didn't, a poet could not say so unless he had been corrupted by 'classical tradition'! In considering 'peculiarities in style: Latinisms,' Mr. Haber adduces a good deal of evidence for what has long been recognized: that the writing of Anglo-Saxon was affected by the Christian use of Latin; but proves little or nothing for a direct knowledge of Virgil. He adduces a number of recognized loan-words, *draca* (*draco*), *deofol* (*diabolus*), *candel* (*candela*), etc., many of them unfortunately completely irrelevant because clearly not borrowed from the *Aeneid*. When the armies of Rome had finished their work in Britain and northern Europe it is somewhat irritating to find under *stræt* 'Note *miratur . . . strata viarum* (*stratas vias* I 422).' We then proceed to 'Broad Similarities in the *Aeneid* and the *Beowulf*,' but scarcely feel that the point at issue is touched when we read that 'Family consciousness, for instance, is a deep-founded trait of both poems' or 'As one sees the Geat struggling in the clutch of the monster [Grendel's mother, whom the Geat in fact conquers] he feels a sympathetic tenseness not unlike the emotions aroused by Vergil's description of Priam's death at the hands of Pyrrhus or Turnus lying helpless beneath the spear of Aeneas.' So the somewhat confused fatalism of the two poems is irrelevant, since there is no doubt that

without reference to Virgil the Angles of the eighth century believed in Wyrð and God and human courage. Because in *Beowulf* helmets are several times described as carrying the figure of a boar—in fact a native Germanic custom, as is proved by the figures on the bronze plate from Öland and the helmet found at Benty Grange, and by Tacitus, *Germ.* 35—we are invited to compare passages in which Virgil implies that helmets had crests and 'A swine-figure occurs on the shield of Aeneas: VIII 641.' Of Haber's 'Parallels in Phraseology' most are clearly not derived from Virgil—*offersittan*, *supersedere*, etc. The final chapter, 'Parallels in Motif and Sentiment,' is no more convincing. Other literatures uninfluenced by Virgil have spoken of fire as 'devouring,' battle as a 'storm,' etc. 'It is said of Grendel that no one knew of his father. . . . This same aspersion is cast against Drances, an unfavourable character in the *Aeneid*.' And Grendel 'is probably the Hydra of the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*' and below on the same

page '*The Beowulf-Grendel Story and the Hercules-Cacus Story*. These important episodes show many significant resemblances: (1) Grendel and Cacus wreak wholesale ravage upon an entire people over a long period of time. (2) They are half-human, of monstrous size; Grendel is spoken of as a "man" but is not of mortal kind, etc.' These are some more glaring examples of Mr. Haber's treatment of evidence. He has done his work with praiseworthy zeal but without clear judgement. Among the many 'parallels' traced with care and ingenuity yet valueless for his purpose are buried one or two more striking (e.g. *Aen.* X. 467-9 with *Beow.* 1386-9 quoted on p. 60) but too few to be deemed more than such coincidences of thought or circumstance as may be found in plenty, e.g. in Ramage's *Bible Echoes in Ancient Classics*. It is dangerous to look long at two such poems forgetting the rest and our common human nature.

R. B. ONIANS.

University of Liverpool.

THE EVOLUTION OF IMPLEMENTS.

The Master Craftsmen: The Story of the Evolution of Implements. By M. GOMPERTZ, B.A., Ph.D. Pp. 268; 184 illustrations in the text. London: Nelson, 1933. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

THIS is not a very satisfactory little book. Its purpose seems to be to tell the story of 'Man, a tool-fashioning Animal' from his earliest beginnings to the height of the present industrial era. In practice, its scope is limited to the Old World in the narrow sense, and in any case the theme is very indifferently handled, though the illustrations are numerous and in themselves not (for the most part) painfully bad.

Attempts to tell the story of any aspect of civilization in small compass and simple style are all theoretically praiseworthy. But Dr. Gompertz's shortcomings here are impossible to conceal.

First, it goes without saying that such a book should maintain the strictest accuracy in matters of fact, and should cover its chosen ground without essential omission. But essential omis-

sions are many. No one could guess from his opening pages that there was any fundamental distinction between the Palaeolithic and Neolithic periods, still less between the two great groups of the Palaeolithic itself: the development of such simple tools as the celt is gravely bungled, and the emergence of the basic Near Eastern and Mediterranean civilizations is handled in the most uncritical and perfunctory manner. And here and later on simple errors abound: the dates of the European Neolithic are not 2000-1200 B.C.: fibulae are not buckles: there is no such tool as a 'blade-like flaker,' nor as a 'socketed winged celt': tweezers are not unknown in the European Bronze Age: Heathery Burn cave has yielded no Stone Age objects. And so on. Thus, while the first part of the book aims at expounding the age-old artisan traditions basic to ancient civilization, the result cannot be called a success. The ensuing chapters on Egypt, the Near East, and the Aegean, are un-

critical confluences from secondary sources. When the classical periods are reached, a second failing appears; the author changes his ground, and embarks on essays on art and architecture, almost without reference to his professed subject of technique. Yet Cave Art has been entirely ignored! The core of the book is the usual textbook adulation of Pheidias and his period: Praxiteles is rather disapprovingly put second, and a Hellenistic chapter follows in which Greek virility is duly recorded as sapped. Yet it is in this chapter that we find Epictetus, Euphronius, and Duris! A return to the original theme is next attempted—very half-heartedly—in a short chapter on 'Tools of the Bible,' but we soon get on to Rome and second-hand art criticism once more: in spite of the Portland Vase, 'unless art springs from some deep feeling in a people, it cannot be induced by any amount of copying and imitation.' This prepares the way for the Dark Ages, when 'the ancient arts suffered a deadly eclipse,' and though Giotto and the Pisani are

sympathetically mentioned, a page or two brings us to the Renaissance. The true subject of the book is now almost out of sight, though Leonardo and Cellini bring in a few more words on technique, and the story of Palissy is told with some feeling; thus the concluding sermon on the Industrial Revolution comes as something of a surprise—and a forcible reminder of the formlessness of the book.

Of the author's style and sentiment an idea will already have been gained. His chapters on Homer and Hesiod bring him nearest to success in tracing the history of technique from analysis of literature, and his actual descriptions of tools are sometimes sound, and often well illustrated by line-drawings. Instructional tedium, too, is conscientiously relieved by anecdote. But with the most sympathetic effort it would be hard to recommend to the young or their would-be teachers a work so obviously intended for them, and so disappointingly unworthy of their attention.

C. F. C. HAWKES.

British Museum.

A. KLEIN: *Child Life in Greek Art*. Pp. xix+62; 40 plates. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, \$3.50 or 22s.

IN this pleasant book Miss Klein tries to do what has scarcely been attempted before. She has searched the museums of Europe and America for authentic representations of child life in ancient Greece—whether on painted vases, sculptured reliefs, or in figures of terracotta or bronze. For such a widely-cast net the haul is slight: but she makes the most of it. The 165 photographs are mostly of a useful size and well reproduced; and an identifying list is given not only of them but also of the 454 unillustrated objects from which some information has been gleaned. The subject itself is considered under nine heads: Infancy; Toys, Pets and Games; Athletic Exercises; Sacrifices and Festivals; School; Music and Dancing; Punishment; Costume; Sickness and Death.

Miss Klein deserves not a little credit for the skill and the perfectly justifiable imagination with which she has contrived to show up a pattern, or rather snatches of pattern, in her necessarily broken fabric. Lovers of children will thank her for the snatches. Hellenists will be inclined to complain, in spite of her warning preface, that she has not further subdivided the slender threads of her material according to period and locality. For instance, on p. 6 she discusses the various types of feeding bottle shown on Plate V. without any reference to their date, which in the case of A and

D must differ by centuries. Similarly there is no hint that the education of girls at Sparta must have differed considerably from that at Athens.

Subject to this qualification the evidence is studied with minute care. Interesting points emerge, such as the conclusion that 'while boys were often allowed to creep or run about unhampered [by clothes], girls of all ages wore the chiton. The presence of such a garment on the figure of a baby, lying on the lap of its nurse, distinguishes it, therefore, as a little girl from the more numerous baby boys' (p. 34).

Some objects remain unexplained. But the 'curiously shaped object' shown in Plate III.D can be paralleled in modern Greece, where a working mother carries her baby to the fields in a *vána*, shaped much like a golfer's bag, with the head peeping out at the upper end: this is then slung from the branch of a tree, and acts as a swinging cradle while the baby sleeps. If anyone doubts this use, I will quote the derivation of the word given me with complete conviction by a mother at Epidaurus, who said it was taken from an old cradle-song containing the words *ὑπὸ γλυκὸν καὶ κάρη*.

M. BRAUNHOLTZ.

La Poesia dell'Iliade. By FRANCESCO ARNALDI. Pp. 98. Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1932. Paper, 20 lire.

SIGNOR ARNALDI takes Homer as he finds him, and considering the *Iliad* as a critic of

great poetry should he has written an eloquent, sympathetic and subtle book. His aim is to discover its characteristic qualities and to follow their development through the poem. He begins by drawing an admirable contrast between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and though he allows that the *Odyssey* is structurally superior and has its own lyrical charm, his own preference is all for the *Iliad*. Indeed his preference has enabled him to make a distinction between the temper and ethical outlook of the two poems which will appeal to the modern *xupistotres* and require the serious attention of all Homeric critics. It is certainly remarkable that if Homer wrote both poems he should so have changed his outlook and even his art. Having delineated the main characteristics of the *Iliad* by this contrast Signor Arnaldi analyses three main themes—the wrath of Achilles, the death of Hector, and the tricking of Zeus. The titles stand for three threads in the story and three different sides of Homer's personality. The distinction is sound and illuminating. The wrath holds the poem together and dictates the most dramatic developments in the plot. The death of Hector is the reflection of Homer's interest in man rather than in heroes, and the tricking of Zeus is the masterpiece of his more gay and irresponsible side.

A bare analysis like this gives little idea of Signor Arnaldi's qualities. On every page of the book there is something new and true, and even if many of his comments may seem half-familiar, few men have stated the essence of Homer's poetic quality so well. His strength is his understanding of heroic poetry, and when for instance he discusses the comparative positions of Achilles and Hector in the poem, he makes us wonder how anyone ever thought that Hector was the real hero of the *Iliad*. For him Achilles is 'a symbol of the destiny of man,' and so, in a sense, he was for Homer. He has much of interest to say of Patroclus and Nestor, and he is particularly at home in his account of Book IX, where he relates apparently discordant elements into an admirably conceived whole. Perhaps he is least successful on the *Διὸς ἀράγη*. Its temper rather shocks him, and he fails to see its true place in Homer's conception of the wilful governance of the world. But no one has understood the conditions of epic composition better than he has, and few have read the *Iliad* with more sympathy.

C. M. BOWRA.

Wadham College, Oxford.

UMBERTINA LISI: *Poetesse Greche*. Pp. 229. Catania: Studio Editoriale Moderno, 1933. Paper, L. 12.

SIGNORINA LISI has written a pleasant little book about ten Greek poetesses. Not all are equally known, nor are their works equally well preserved, and though there is little new to be said about Praxilla, Moero, Nossis, Hedyle and Melinno, it is worth while to have on paper the few facts which can be gathered about them. In treating authors of whose works so little survives, there is a risk of generalizing too much from the extant remains, and when we are told

that 'l'amore per Nosside è gioia' or of Hedyle that 'quel che perde in grandezza ed ingenuità, acquista in intimità e finezza,' we feel that however true these judgments may be of the extant remains, they are of doubtful value on the poetesses' work as a whole. But even about the scanty remains there is something to be said, and Signorina Lisi has not only good taste and sound judgment, but she is well acquainted with the modern literature on her subject. She moves easily among conflicting theories and errs neither on the side of dogma nor of scepticism. If in the end she has not always a great deal to say, it is because the limited nature of her material forbids a full statement.

The best chapters of the book are on Sappho and Corinna. Signorina Lisi treats Sappho with sense and moderation, avoiding those transports of decadent sensibility to which too often the great poetess impels her admirers. Problems of chronology are well discussed; linguistic difficulties are treated with quiet competence; even the vexed question of Sappho's character is determined without recourse either to moral indignation or to psycho-analysis. Quotations are well chosen, and in fragmentary pieces the supplements are made with taste and knowledge. On Corinna Signorina Lisi has much of interest for English readers. She quotes the new fragment of the *Opiaras*, interesting not so much for its four broken lines as for the suggestion which it prompts that if Corinna could write on Orestes, perhaps Pindar was not so wanton and irrelevant as he has been thought when he broke so unexpectedly into the same story in *Pythian* XI, written for a Theban victor. Of course Signorina Lisi touches on many controversial problems and cannot always command our assent. It is, for instance, possible that Praxilla is earlier than Eusebius makes her, that Sappho never went to Sicily, that Erinna lived later than 352 B.C. But on these questions certainty is impossible, and Signorina Lisi always makes a tenable case for her opinions.

C. M. BOWRA.

Wadham College, Oxford.

A Guide to the Principal Coins of the Greeks, from circa 700 B.C. to A.D. 270. Based on the work of B. V. HEAD. Pp. viii + 106; 50 colotype plates. London: British Museum, 1932. Cloth, 15s.

THE name of Barclay V. Head appears in pious memory, as Sir George Hill in his preface explains, upon the title-page of this book, which has grown out of the successive editions of his *Coins of the Ancients*, first published in 1880. The material has since greatly grown: and the present volume, as its title indicates, omits Roman coins. But chronologically it has extended the survey of Greek coins down to the end of the reign of Gallienus, making eight periods in place of the former seven; and some bronze coins are added. While the introductions to Periods I-VII (except for the omission of the comparisons between numismatic art and contemporary sculpture) and the description of the coins themselves remain largely un-

touched, the earlier periods receive somewhat more attention than before, a change which will be generally welcome. Of the 801 coins illustrated, 293 belong to Periods I and II (circa 700-400 B.C.); of these, 120 are earlier than 480 B.C. Period III (circa 400-366 B.C.) claims 160; the remaining 348 are distributed over Periods IV-VIII. Geographically, the familiar divisions A, B and C (roughly Asia, Greece and the West respectively) are retained: the numerical superiority of A is due mainly to the greater measure of freedom in minting (in bronze) allowed under the Roman Empire to the cities of Asia Minor. Historically, the addition of Period VIII is a gain.

The description of the coins—which excellently represent the national collection as it now stands—takes cognizance of the latest scholarship, cautiously indicating controversial views; occasional inconsistency—e.g. the use of both *cantharus* and *kantharos*—is doubtless due to repetition of the wording of previous issues; so too the use of the word 'damsel' to describe the type of Segesta (p. 13, no. 27).

Weights are now given both in grains troy and in grammes, and there is a note on weight standards; the coins are indexed geographically and by rulers; a concordance affords comparison with *Coins of the Ancients*.⁴ Plates and typography are excellent; inscriptions are quoted in small type without breathings or accents. This admirable book deserves wide support, and is, at the price, the best general introduction in English to Greek coins.

W. L. CUTLER.

Downing College, Cambridge.

Aristote et les Mystères. By JEANNE CROISANT. Pp. ix+218. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège.) Paris: Droz, 1932. Paper, 55 fr.

THIS is a very unequal though promising book. It begins well, with the *Politics* and the use of catharsis in the mysteries—then Plato's interpretation of the mysteries, to the point, and admirably documented from the *Phaedrus*, the *Republic* and the *Laus*. Aristotle on the same is not so good, for the authoress lets herself go with all kinds of irrelevant asides—dreams, luck, sorts of both—ere we finally reach something worth while, the distinction between the Pythagorean and the Aristotelian catharsis. The former cures by opposites and the lyre, forbidding (as did Plato later) the *αἰλός*: the latter cures by homoeopathy and admits the *αἰλός*. Too little is often made of this important contrast, and of the resemblance, which Dr. Croissant points out, between Aristotle's theory and modern views on psycho-analysis. On the vexed question of Gorgias as a connecting link between Pythagoras and Plato, she sides against Rostagni. Yet, if catharsis was as much in the air as she is at pains to prove, what more likely than that Gorgias should have used it too? In the chapter on Aristotle's use of it, she chides—not before time—Weil and Bernays for insisting on an exclusively medical connotation of the term in Aristotle's

thought. Catharsis is mainly *ἰατρεία*, but its early associations are religious. Aristotle's originality was to unite the two conceptions. And that is the best of the book, apart from a very excellent synopsis of the chapters in the final index. But there is now a tedious disquisition on that deadest of all dead horses—the theory of the humours—with not a single physical detail omitted—whereas only the principle is germane to the subject: then an account of some fragments of late Neo-Platonists that may be supposed to refer to catharsis: Aristotle's statement about the initiates, *οὐ μαθεῖν τι δεῖν ἀλλὰ παθεῖν*, as quoted by Synesius and now also in a recently published fragment of Psellus. But to rest on this single sentence, torn from its context and given us, at best, by third-rate doctrinaires of a rival school, a whole theory of mysticism and foist it on Aristotle with monotonous iteration of 'sans doute,' 'sans aucun doute,' 'sans nul doute,' is not only unconvincing and annoying. It is, or should be, unworthy of a scholar.

C. KEITH.

St. Hilda's College, Oxford.

ALBRECHT BECKER: *Die Aristotelische Theorie der Möglichkeitsschlüsse*. Pp. 98. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1933. Paper, RM. 3.80.

BRADLEY found modality 'not an alluring theme.' This, after Kant, may seem surprising; yet the perusal of Aristotle's formal treatment in *An. Pri.* I, 13-22 of syllogisms containing contingent premisses might well provoke such a comment. But not from Herr Becker. He devotes to these chapters an industrious monograph, which is not, however, made more readable by a reformulation of Aristotle's results in logistical symbols.

His clue—the right one, I think—is Aristotle's strict definition (*An. Pri.* 32a 18-20) of *τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον* as what is neither (a) necessary, nor (b) productive of an impossible consequence. Passages implying a looser definition which does not exclude the necessary, he attributes mainly to interpolation, borrowing Professor Jaeger's authority in general to regard *An. Pri.* as a sketch rather than a finished work. This of course enables him to circumvent many difficulties. Yet, though Aristotle's curt and often apparently disconnected sentences offer a strong temptation to the stratifier and the athetizer, the whole hypothesis of Professor Jaeger raises no fewer problems than it solves. The Higher Criticism has all the dangerous charm of detective investigation, but we have probably to expect in Aristotelian scholarship a cooling of enthusiasm comparable to the present reaction from the 'patchwork' view of Kant's first Critique. Aristotle—particularly in the ethical sphere—was always in difficulties with the notions of possibility and contingency, and I fancy that some of these difficulties are reflected in the last half of *An. Pri.* I.

In Chapter VIII Herr Becker contends that Aristotle is not working out a logic of *τὸ ὅς ἐστι τὸ πολὺ*, and he accordingly regards 32b 4-22, a passage which might seem to indicate the

opposite, as probably a later marginal suggestion by Aristotle, which subsequently crept into the text. I think that Herr Becker is misled. He interprets τὸ ὅς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ as 'true in the majority of instances,' and points to the difficulty of equating it with τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον as defined in 32a 18-20—e.g., I suppose, if 'all A may be B' implies that 'all A may not be B,' then you cannot substitute for it 'A in a majority of instances is B.' But this argument assumes wrongly that the Aristotelian syllogism can be expressed in purely quantitative terms. Though Aristotle constantly expresses a necessary and universal premiss in the form 'all A is B,' yet *Post. An.* I, 2 and 4 leave no doubt that 'allness,' truth in every instance, is a mere symptom of necessity and universality. Correspondingly, I fancy, beneath the quantitative expression of τὸ ὅς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ (e.g. in *Top.* 112b 10 ff.) lies the notion of a real indeterminateness ἐν τῇ πράγματι: as 'allness' is a symptom of necessity, so 'in a majority of instances' is symptomatic of a δύναμις ἐναντίων in things. Even in *An. Pri.* Aristotle's logic never degenerates into a mere logic of classes. Herr Becker has not realized this. Indeed, if he had, he might not have attempted to restate it logically.

G. R. G. MURE.

Merton College, Oxford.

ERNST GRUMACH: *Physis und Agathon in der alten Stoa*. Pp. 80. (Problemata, Heft 6.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1932. Paper, RM. 6.

A GREAT merit of this work, an expanded doctoral thesis, is that it refuses to treat Stoicism as an intellectually degenerate philosophy, fit product of an era of 'loss of nerve.' The author realizes that Zeno knew the work of Plato and Aristotle well, and did not and could not ignore them; his philosophy is as much conditioned by the problems they raised as by any reasons of emotion or political history.

The first chapter of the book is entitled 'Relations between the Conception of Nature and Ethics.' It contains an excellent exposition of Stoic ethics, which brings out what Cato in Cicero's *de finibus* calls the *admirabilis compositio disciplinae incredibilisque rerum ordo*, and shows with what success they faced the difficulties of the Socratic supremacy of ἀρετή and its explanation as ἐπιστήμη. The way in which evidence from all kinds of source and different centuries is employed without distinction may cause uneasiness, but I believe that this leads to doubtful or erroneous results in the first section only, on the Knowledge of the Good, and the connected excursus on πρῶτης (cf. *C.Q.*, 1930, p. 44).

The second chapter deals with the origin of the Stoic idea of Nature; it is not easy to follow, but it is interesting and stimulating. Dr. Grumach gives an account of post-Socratic metaphysics in terms of an opposition between the efficient and the formal cause. This opposition was resolved in Aristotle's Unmoved Mover, but the solution was unsatisfactory even to Theophrastus, who reintroduced the idea of the world-soul as mover. The Stoics resolved

the opposition in their φύσις. And we no longer have a static εἶδος but a dynamic conception instead, the ὁδός. For Aristotle τέχνη depends on the possession of the εἶδος; for the Stoics τέχνη is essentially a method, a ὁδός. So φύσις is defined by Zeno as πῦρ τεχνικὸν ὁδῶς βαδίζον εἰς γένεσιν. The ideas here seem to me to be fruitful and worth developing.

On p. 34 a passage of Cicero, and on p. 73 one of Porphyry, are wrongly interpreted.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

CARL DARLING BUCK. *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Pp. xvi+405. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1933. Cloth, 27s. 6d.

FOR many years teachers of philology in this country have felt the want of an up-to-date manual containing the most essential facts of the comparative grammar of Latin and Greek. The author has set out to supply this want, and he claims rigid orthodoxy. Syntax is ignored—a safe and well established tradition. The book provides a brief introduction on the Indo-European family of languages and a general survey of the principles of linguistic evolution. In the paragraphs on analogy (p. 45) one misses the mention of Paul's proportion formula, which despite Hermann (*Lautgesetz und Analogie*) is not merely an empty schema. There follows a complete survey of the nominal and verbal systems of both languages, including word-formation. One or two points call for criticism.

In the treatment of the pronouns ille, olle is derived from a stem *olno, 'the source of certain Slavic forms,' while ipse is derived from is-pse, where no parallel is adduced for the second half of the compound. Kretschmer has suggested (KZ. 31, 438) the Syracusan ψφ. (=σφ) as a possibility. But actually a better explanation is ready to hand on the lines already suggested by Sommer (Hdb.², p. 431). Ipse is a combination of is+se, where the -se stands to the pronoun so- as -te does to *to-. In the accusative eum-sum the -p- would arise by epenthesis as in sum-p-si, etc., and would then be transferred by analogy to the rest of the declension. Similarly olle is a combination of ol- and the same pronoun se, *olse becoming olle as *vel-se becomes velle (so Lindsay, *The Latin Language*, p. 430). These explanations have the advantage of being derived from known Latin sources. Etymology should if possible begin at home.

In the numerals septuaginta is left without an explanation, the author evidently rejecting the possibility of *octuaginta's being the source. Yet in the Greek papyri we find two examples of precisely the same associational interference among the numerals 'seventy' and 'eighty.' For ἑβδομήκοντα we find εἰδοήκοντα (=ἑβδομήκοντα) in Ox. 1655, 12, 2nd cent. A.D., and on the other hand ὀδομήκοντα for ἑβδομήκοντα in Ox. 728, 32, 2nd cent. A.D.

Despite these minor criticisms, all teachers of classical philology must be indebted to the author for a thorough and reliable book which would

be gladly recommended to students but for the price, which despite the fall in the dollar is still prohibitive.

L. R. PALMER.

University of Manchester.

Démonstration de la Parenté des Langues indo-européennes et sémitiques. By MICHEL HONNORAT. Pp. 398. Paris: Geuthner, 1933. Paper, 65 fr.

M. HONNORAT'S *Démonstration* appears to be based on nothing more substantial than etymologies like: Arab. Haraga: 'grec Hares, latin Horko,' and is not very convincing. The identification of the name of the Ionians with the 'Chinese' Yvnk should be mentioned.

J. FRASER.

NICOLA TERZAGHI. *Prolegomena a Terensio.* Pp. 107. Turin: 'L' Erma', 1931. Paper, L. 10.

THIS essay deals with much the same material as that treated in Fabia's work, but the author has kept abreast of recent research, and gives us a critical account of the facts and traditions connected with Terence's life, and a detailed analysis of the plays. After intro-

ductory remarks on the pre-Terentian palliata, he shows that Evanthius' remarks about prologues must refer to polemical prologues in such predecessors of Terence as Naevius. An interesting account of Caecilius is followed by the text of Suetonius' *Vita P. Terenti Afri*. Terence fared ill at the hands of ancient biographers; Terzaghi shows the untrustworthiness of their more scandalous charges.

Terence's short life was lived in an atmosphere of bitter literary polemic. Terzaghi traces the course of the struggle with Lanuvius to the final stage when Terence shows himself (in the prologue to the *Adelphi*) at last able to despise the jealousy of his disappointed rival. The plays are analysed with reference to Donatus' commentary, and Terzaghi agrees with the judgment of the Roman populace in giving highest praise to the *Eunuchus*. The comments of Caesar and Horace are examined; the *ars* in which Terence 'excels' was rhetorical. An account of his use of asyndeton, alliteration, assonance, etc., concludes this thoughtful essay, which presents us in a brief compass with all that is essential in an introductory study.

W. BEARE.

University of Bristol.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

(A reference to *C.R.* denotes a notice already published in the *Classical Review*.)

GNOMON.

(IX. 7. JULY, 1933.)

C. Schmidt und H. J. Polotsky: *Ein Mani-Fund aus Ägypten. Originalschriften des Mani und seiner Schüler.* Mit einem Beitrag von H. Ibscher [Berlin: de Gruyter (SBBerl. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1933, 1)] (Schraeder). Reviewer, in a long discussion, recommends the book both for the intrinsic importance of the new material and for the results achieved by the industry and erudition of the authors, though he disagrees with some of their conclusions. J. Kroll: *Gott und Hölle* [*C.R.* XLVI. 230] (Kerényi). Reviewer's interpretation of the evidence differs in some respects from K.'s, but he finds the book rich in information and suggestion. F. Saxl: *Mithras: Typengeschichtliche Untersuchungen* [*C.R.* XLVII. 96] (Deubner). The book revives many questions. The illustrations alone will be most helpful for future research. E. Sprockhoff: *Zur Handelsgeschichte der germanischen Bronzezeit* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1930. Pp. xii + 161, 45 plates] (Kunkel). A welcome link between the hitherto uncorrelated work on prehistoric and early Germanic history respectively. M. Schanz: *Geschichte der römischen Literatur.* Part I: *Die römische Literatur in der Zeit der Republik.* Fourth edition revised by C. Hosius [Munich: Beck, 1927. Pp. xiv + 654] (Fraenkel). H.'s revision of Schanz is in-

dispensable; but the abridgement is not always satisfactory and scholars will still find a use for the fuller third edition. M. Cary: *A History of the Greek World from 323 to 146 B.C.* [*C.R.* XLVI. 217] (Miltner). A useful account of a little-treated period. Reviewer criticizes the arrangement of the material, influenced by the C.A.H., and some details. E. Cavaignac: *La Paix Romaine* [Paris: de Boccard, 1928. Pp. 494] (Hohl). An ill-balanced account of the period, marred by many inaccuracies. The lack of an index makes the book difficult to use. R. M. Haywood: *Studies on Scipio Africanus* [Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933. Pp. 114] (Gelzer). A useful book, though it tends to over-simplify complicated problems. St. Gsell: *Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord*, vols. 7 and 8 [Paris: Hachette, 1928. Pp. 312, 306] (Vogt). The two volumes cover the period 146 B.C. to A.D. 40, and show all the qualities of their predecessors. A. Oliva: *La politica granaria di Roma antica* (265 B.C. to A.D. 410) [Piacenza: Fed. Ital. dei Consorzi Agrari, 1930. Pp. x + 296] (Heichelheim). Interesting on some technical points, but spoilt as history by ignorance of modern work not in French or Italian. W. Brockmeier: *De Sancti Eustathii episcopi Antiocheni dicendi ratione* [Diss. inaug. Münster, 1932. Pp. vi + 143] (Radermacher). More comprehensive in scope than most dissertations. R. Cadiou: *Introduction au*

système d'Origène [Paris : Les Belles Lettres, 1932. Pp. 114] (Benz). A readable book; but it evades difficulties and is founded on haphazard and second-hand citations.

(IX. 8. AUGUST, 1933.)

Inscriptiones Graecae. Ed. minor. Vol. IX, part 1, fasc. 1: *Inscriptiones Aetolicae*. Ed. G. Klaffenbach [Berlin : de Gruyter, 1932. Pp. lvi+128] (Latte). The book presents a complete history of Aetolia. This volume is the last to which Wilamowitz contributed notes, and the editor ably carries out his principles, which reviewer hopes will always govern work on inscriptions. *Corinth*, vol. VIII, part 1: *Greek Inscriptions* [C.R. XLVI. 63] (Peck). Very few of the inscriptions are intelligible or important, but the editor has done a thankless task well. Reviewer contributes some supplements. Part 2: *Latin Inscriptions*, 1896-1926, edited by A. B. West, 1931. [Pp. xvi+171, 177 illustrations] (Lommatsch). W. deserves the greatest praise for the accuracy of his edition and the erudition of his commentary. 'Ελευσινιακά ὑπὸ Κ. Κουρουπιώτη τῇ συνεργασίᾳ τῶν Διδ. Γ. Μυλωνᾶ, 'Αναστ. 'Ορλάνδου, 'Ιωάννου Τραϊάλου, 'Ιωάννου Θρεψιάδη [Athens : Hestia, 1932. Pp. 278] (Rubensohn). The first volume of a comprehensive account of Eleusis. Most important is M.'s article on Prehistoric Eleusis [cf. C.R. XLVII. 135]. K. discusses two important inscriptions on which reviewer comments at length. Three other articles complete a useful volume. Helge Lyngby: *Textkritiska studier till Celsus' Medicina* [Diss. Göteborg, 1931. Pp. 87] (Niedermann). A very able first book. L. successfully defends the manuscript tradition against Marx and, when there is real corruption, often replaces earlier conjectures by better. M. Heidegger: *Die Selbstbehauptung der deutschen Universität* [Breslau : Korn, 1933. Pp. 22] (Harder). The author in this recitorial address analyses the true purpose of learning and emphasizes the importance of Greek philosophy. C. Bailey: *Phases in the Religion of Ancient Rome* [C.R. XLVII. 21] (Rose). Favourable. Cf. same reviewer's notice in C.R. loc. cit. W. Hartke: *De saeculi quarti exeuntis historiarum scriptoribus quaestiones*. [Diss. Berlin, 1932. Pp. 70] (Bickel). H. prepares the ground for a critical edition of Rufus Festus and for a comparison of his work with other authors of *Breviaria*. Of special interest is his treatment of language and rhythm. 1. F. G. Kenyon: *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome* [C.R. XLVII. 71], 2. B. L. Ullmann: *Ancient Writing and its Influence* [C.R. *ibid.*] (Schubart). 1. A welcome book for all who are interested in ancient books but cannot attack the larger works on the subject. 2. Unsatisfactory on Greek and too brief in its concluding chapter on subsidiary matters; but good on the history of Latin writing. Fra Mariano da Firenze O.F.M.: *Itinerarium Urbis Romae*, with introduction and notes by P. E. Bulletti [Rome : Pontif.

Istit. di Archeol. Christ., 1931. Pp. xxii+251] (Klauser). M.'s book, written A.D. 1517-18, is interesting as the first guide-book of its kind; but though useful on ecclesiastical Rome, it depends for ancient Rome on inaccurate evidence, and B.'s notes, though painstaking, help but little.—Bibliographical Supplement, 1933, No. 4 (down to 31 July).

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(JULY, 1933.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—B. Lavagnini, *Nuova antologia dei frammenti della lirica greca* [C.R. XLVII. 125] (Kalinka). Commentary shows that L. is up to date in his knowledge of recent relevant literature; his own restorations and explanations deserve careful consideration.

LATIN LITERATURE.—P. Ovidius Naso Vol. III fasc. 2. F. W. Lenz [C.R. XLVI. 275] (Klotz). Not much change in text, but critical apparatus has gained considerably in quantity and in clearness.—H. Mörland, *Die lateinischen Oribasiusübersetzungen*. Symbolae Osloenses fasc. supplet. V [Oslo, 1932, Brøgger. Pp. 202] (Kind). Valuable preliminary work towards a new edition of these interesting translations. All relevant MSS. have been collated with more reliable results than were possible hitherto.—N. Terzaghi, *Per la storia della satira* [C.R. XLVI. 263] (Hosius). Starting from a sketch of history of Cynic diatribe T. examines the motives of moral satire in Phaedrus, Petronius, and Martial. In spite of some doubts reviewer gratefully accepts T.'s manifold results.—Cicéron, *Discours Tome IX* [C.R. XLVII. 87] (Klotz). Introduction deals with all important points and discusses them thoroughly; text satisfactory; translation smooth and pleasing.

HISTORY.—F. Cornelius, *Cannae* [C.R. XLVI. 167] (Klotz). Contains much that is helpful besides not a little that is untenable; but the former outweighs the latter.

LANGUAGE.—H. Dahlmann, *Varro und die hellenistische Sprachtheorie* [C.R. XLVI. 234] (Klotz). Difficult and much-discussed problem successfully handled. A very valuable contribution to our understanding of the 'De Lingua Latina.'

ARCHAEOLOGY.—W. Vermeulen, *Een Romeinsch Grafveld op den Hunnerberg te Nijmegen* [C.R. XLVII. 89] (Kraemer). Successive chapters contain an account of the excavations and types of pottery, a catalogue, and very noteworthy conclusions. Interesting and instructive.

ANTIQUITIES.—P. Lavedan, *Dictionnaire illustré de la mythologie et des antiquités grecques et romaines* [Paris, 1931, Hachette. Pp. 1037, with 1015 figures] (Lamer). Extracted from Daremberg-Saglio and brought up to date. Shows good taste, great industry, and wealth of knowledge. Reviewer criticizes the limitation in scope; errors also occur, but these can easily be corrected in the next edition. The illustrations, though sometimes poor in quality, are a very welcome feature.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

**.* Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- Atkinson** (B. F. C.) *The Greek Language*. Second edition, revised. Pp. ix + 354. London: Faber, 1933. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Barnes** (A. S.) *The Martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul*. Pp. xii + 184; illustrations. London: Milford, 1933. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Cesareo** (E.) *Propertius. Elegie scelte, con un saggio su "La Poesia di Propertius"*. Pp. xxxi + 77. Naples: Morano, 1933. Paper, L. 5.
- Chanter** (R.) *Music to the Alcestis of Euripides, with the Greek Text, and an English Translation*. Pp. viii + 44. London: Oxford University Press. Paper, 5s.
- d'Agostino** (V.) *M. Fabio Quintiliano. Il libro primo della Istituzione Oratoria col commento di V. d'A.* Pp. xxvii + 195. (Scrittori latini commentati per le Scuole.) Turin, etc.: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1933. Paper, L. 8.
- Drexler** (H.) *Plautinische Akzentstudien*. Registerband. Pp. 72. Breslau: Marcus, 1933. Paper, M. 4.20.
- Eos. *Commentarii Societatis Philologiae Polonorum*. Vol. xxxiv. Pp. 488. 1933.**
- Hamilton** (E.) *The Roman Way*. Pp. xiv + 281. London: Dent, 1933. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Harry** (J. E.) *Greek Tragedy. Emendations, interpretations and critical notes*. Vol. I. *Aeschylus and Sophocles*. Pp. xxv + 232. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, 24s. 6d. net.
- Headlam** (J. W.) *Election by Lot at Athens*. Second edition revised by D. C. Macgregor. Pp. xxvi + 215. Cambridge: University Press, 1933. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Hocart** (A. M.) *The Progress of Man. A short survey of his evolution, his customs and his works*. Pp. xvi + 316. London: Methuen, 1933. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Inge** (W. R.) *God and the Astronomers*. Pp. xiii + 308. London, etc.: Longmans, 1933. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Juhász** (L.) *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentiorisque Aevorum. Saec. XII-XIII. P. Magister, Gesta Hungarorum*. Edidit L. J. Pp. 7 + 100. Saec. XV. *Barius, Kostolan, Hungarus, Zagabriensis*. Ed. L. J. Pp. vi + 24. *Callimachus Experiens*, etc. Ed. T. Kardos. Pp. vi + 28. *Martius, Carmina*. Ed. L. J. Pp. viii + 28. *Martius, Epistolae*. Ed. L. J. Pp. viii + 12. *Martius, Invectivae*. Ed. L. J. Pp. iv + 46. *Seneca, Historia Bononiensis*. Ed. J. Fögel. Pp. v + 68. *Saec. XV-XVI. Verinus, Panegyricon*. Ed. J. F. et L. J. Pp. iv + 40. *Fontius, Carmina*. Ed. J. F. et L. J. Pp. vi + 34. *Fontius, Epistolarum libri III*. Ed. L. J. Pp. x + 81. *Celtis, Oratio*. Ed. J. Rupprich. Pp. vi + 20. Leipzig: Teubner, 1932-3. Paper, RM. 5.40, 1.50, 1.70, 1.80, 1.0, 2.50, 3.60, 2.20, 2.0, 4.50, 1.30.
- Kellett** (E. E.) *A Short History of Religions*. Pp. 607. London: Victor Gollancz, 1933. Cloth, 5s.
- Kroll** (W.) *Die Kultur der ciceronischen Zeit*. II. *Religion, Gesellschaft, Bildung, Kunst*. Pp. 193; 4 plates. (Das Erbe der Alten, 2. Reihe XXIII.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1933. Paper, M. 7.20 (bound, 8).
- Lamer** (H.) *Wörterbuch der Antike mit Berücksichtigung ihres Fortwirkens*. In Verbindung mit E. Bux und W. Schöne verfasst von H. L. Pp. xii + 784. Leipzig: Kröner, 1933. Cloth, M. 5.80.
- Lemmi** (C. W.) *The Classical Deities in Bacon. A study in mythological symbolism*. Pp. ix + 224. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Mattingly** (H.) and **Robinson** (E. S. G.) *The date of the Roman denarius and other landmarks in early Roman coinage*. Pp. 59; 3 plates. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XVIII.) London: Milford. Paper, 5s. net.
- Oppermann** (H.) *Caesar. Der Schriftsteller und sein Werk*. Pp. 112. (Neue Wege zur Antike, II. Reihe, Heft 2.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1933. Paper, RM. 5.80.
- Papyri from Tebtunis. Part I. By A. E. R. Boak. In two volumes. Pp. xvi + 259; 4 plates. (Univ. of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XXVIII.) Michigan Papyri, Vol. II.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1933. Cloth.**
- Ralli** (A.) *Later Critiques*. Pp. 117. London etc.: Longmans, 1933. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Russell** (W. A.) *The development of the art of language as exhibited in Latin and in English*. Pp. 174. London: Williams and Norgate, 1933. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Schuster** (M.) *Plinius minor. Opera*. Edidit M. S. Pp. xxix + 497. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1933. Paper, RM. 9.20 (bound, 10.50).
- Shirley** (F. J.) *Memorabilia Latina*. Pp. 64. London: Bell, 1933. Cloth, 9d.
- Skard** (E.) *Ennius und Sallustius. Eine sprachliche Untersuchung*. Pp. 83. (Avh. utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Kl. 1933. No. 4.) Oslo: Dybwad, 1933. Paper, Kr. 4.50.
- Tidche** (E.) *Thespis*. Pp. 30. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1933. Paper, RM. 1.50.
- Türk Tarih, Arkeologiya ve Etnografya Dergisi*. No. 1, July 1933. Pp. 195. Published on behalf of the [Turkish] Ministry of Education. Istanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1933.
- Wace** (A. J. B.) *Chamber Tombs at Mycenae*. Pp. xiii + 24; 57 plates. (Archaeologia, Vol. LXXXII.) Printed at Oxford for the Society of Antiquaries, 1932. Cloth.
- Walbank** (F. W.) *Aratus of Sicyon*. Pp. ix + 222. Cambridge: University Press, 1933. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Way** (A. S.) *Lucretius on the Problem of Existence*. In English Verse. Pp. vii + 215. London: Macmillan, 1933. Cloth, 5s. net.

ent for
blished

a Zeit.
Kunst.
Alten.
1933.

mit
In
chöne
ipzig :

Bacon.
Pp. ix
pkins
12s.

) The
land-
59;
f the
ndon :

er und
r An-
erlin :

E. R.
59; 4
uman-
apyri,
higan

ndon
net.
ne art
nd in
s and

Edidit
r. et
1933.

p. 64.

rach-
utgitt
Oslo
Oslo :

and
50.
rgisi.
d on
ation.

enae.
Vol.
ociety

. ix +
1933.

m of
+215.
net.